

**THE TEXT IS FLY
WITHIN THE BOOK
ONLY**

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on his card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.




PUBLIC LIBRARY
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in this Pocket



3 1148 00673 8702

THE PRESIDENTS
OF THE UNITED STATES
VOLUME II



A. Lincoln

From a photograph by Gardner.

THE PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

1789-1914

BY

JOHN FISKE, CARL SCHURZ, ROBERT C. WINTHROP,
GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS, GEORGE BANCROFT,
JOHN HAY, AND MANY OTHERS

EDITED BY

JAMES GRANT WILSON

ILLUSTRATED

VOLUME II

NEW YORK

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1914

COPYRIGHT, 1914

By CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

APR 6 1914



CONTENTS

	PAGE
MARTIN VAN BUREN	
By James C. Welling	1
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON	
By Arthur E. Bostwick	29
JOHN TYLER	
By John Fiske	49
JAMES K. POLK	
By George Bancroft	89
ZACHARY TAYLOR	
By Jefferson Davis	121
MILLARD FILLMORE	
By James Grant Wilson	145
FRANKLIN PIERCE	
By Bainbridge Wadleigh	175
JAMES BUCHANAN	
By George Ticknor Curtis	203
ABRAHAM LINCOLN	
By John Hay	245

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

ABRAHAM LINCOLN	
From a photograph by Gardner	<i>Frontispiece</i>
	<i>Facing Page</i>
MARTIN VAN BUREN	
From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C. . . .	4
FAC-SIMILE LETTER FROM MARTIN VAN BUREN TO FITZ-GREENE HALLECK	18
LINDENWALD, KINDERHOOK, N. Y., THE HOME OF MARTIN VAN BUREN	24
WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON	
From a portrait in the possession of Bettie Harrison Eaton, North Bend, Ohio	32
FAC-SIMILE LETTER FROM WILLIAM HENRY HAR- RISON TO DAVID K. ESTE	40
JOHN TYLER	
From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C. . . .	52
SHERWOOD FOREST, GREENE CO., VA., THE HOME OF JOHN TYLER	64
FAC-SIMILE OF LAST PAGE OF LETTER FROM JOHN TYLER TO DAVID S. GARDINER	80
JAMES K. POLK	
From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C. . . .	92
FAC-SIMILE OF LAST PAGE OF LETTER FROM JAMES KNOX POLK TO MRS. SARAH C. POLK	102
POLK PLACE, NASHVILLE, TENN., THE HOME AND TOMB OF JAMES K. POLK	106
ZACHARY TAYLOR	
From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C. . . .	124
FAC-SIMILE OF LAST PAGE OF LETTER FROM ZACH- ARY TAYLOR TO JOHN J. CRITTENDEN	134

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Facing Page

HOME OF ZACHARY TAYLOR, NEAR LOUISVILLE, KY. 138

MILLARD FILLMORE

From a photograph by Baker, Buffalo, N. Y. 148

FAC-SIMILE LETTER FROM MILLARD FILLMORE TO

JAMES GRANT WILSON 164

HOME OF MILLARD FILLMORE, NIAGARA SQUARE,

BUFFALO, N. Y., AS IT APPEARS AT THE PRES-

ENT TIME 170

FRANKLIN PIERCE

From a painting by G. P. A. Healy in the Corcoran Gallery,

Washington, D. C. 178

BIRTHPLACE OF FRANKLIN PIERCE, AT HILLS-

BOROUGH, N. H. 182

FAC-SIMILE LETTER FROM FRANKLIN PIERCE TO

WILLIAM L. MARCY 188

JAMES BUCHANAN ✓

From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C. 206

WHEATLAND, NEAR LANCASTER, PA., THE HOME

OF JAMES BUCHANAN 222

FAC-SIMILE LETTER FROM JAMES BUCHANAN TO

AARON V. BROWN 238

STATUE OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN IN JACKSON PARK,

CHICAGO, ILL.

Augustus Saint-Gaudens, Sculptor 248

HOME OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN, SPRINGFIELD, ILL. 252

FAC-SIMILE OF THE ADDRESS DELIVERED BY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AT THE DEDICATION OF

THE NATIONAL CEMETERY AT GETTYSBURG . 280

FAC-SIMILE LETTER FROM ABRAHAM LINCOLN TO

JOHN S. STUART 288

THE PROPOSED LINCOLN MEMORIAL, WASHINGTON,

D. C. EASTERN FAÇADE FACING WASHINGTON

MONUMENT.

Henry Bacon, Architect 300

PORTRAITS OF THE LADIES OF THE WHITE HOUSE

FROM 1837 TO 1865 *End of Volume*

MARTIN VAN BUREN

BY

JAMES C. WELLING

MARTIN VAN BUREN

MARTIN VAN BUREN, eighth president of the United States, born in Kinderhook, Columbia County, N. Y., December 5, 1782; died there, July 24, 1862. He was the eldest son of Abraham Van Buren, a small farmer, and of Mary Hoes (originally spelled Goes), whose first husband was named Van Allen. Martin studied the rudiments of English and Latin in the schools of his native village, and read law in the office of Francis Sylvester at the age of fourteen years. Rising as a student by slow gradations from office-boy to lawyer's clerk, copyist of pleas, and finally to the rank of special pleader in the constables' courts, he patiently pursued his legal novitiate through the term of seven years and familiarized himself with the technique of the bar and with the elements of common law. Combining with these professional studies a fondness for extemporaneous debate, he was early noted for his intelligent observation of public events and for his interest in politics. He was chosen to participate in a nominating convention when he was only eighteen years old. In 1802 he went to New York and there studied law with

4 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

William P. Van Ness, a friend of Aaron Burr. He was admitted to the bar in 1803, returned to Kinderhook, and associated himself in practice with his half-brother, James J. Van Allen.

Van Buren was a zealous adherent of Jefferson, and supported Morgan Lewis for governor of New York in 1803 against Aaron Burr. In February, 1807, he married Hannah Hoes, a distant kinswoman, and in the winter of 1806-'7 he removed to Hudson, the county-seat of Columbia County, and in the same year was admitted to practice in the supreme court. In the state election of 1807 he supported Daniel D. Tompkins for governor against Morgan Lewis, the latter, in the factional changes of New York politics, having come to be considered less true than the former to the measures of Jefferson. In 1808 Van Buren became surrogate of Columbia County, displacing his half-brother and partner, who belonged to the defeated faction. He held this office till 1813, when, on a change of party predominance at Albany, his half-brother was restored. Attentively watching the drift of political events, he figured in the councils of his party at a convention held in Albany early in 1811, when the proposed recharter of the United States bank was the leading question of Federal politics. Though Albert Gallatin, secretary of the treasury, had recommended a recharter, the predominant sentiment of the Republican party was



Franklin Pierce

From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C.

adverse to the measure. Van Buren shared in this hostility and publicly lauded the "Spartan firmness" of George Clinton when as vice-president he gave his casting-vote in the U. S. senate against the bank bill, February 20, 1811.

In 1812 Van Buren was elected to the senate of New York from the middle district as a Clinton Republican, defeating Edward P. Livingston, the candidate of the "Quids," by a majority of 200. He took his seat in November of that year and became thereby a member of the court of errors, then composed of senators in connection with the chancellor and the supreme court. As senator he strenuously opposed the charter of "the Bank of America," which, with a large capital and with the promise of liberal subsidies to the state treasury, was then seeking to establish itself in New York and to take the place of the United States bank. He upheld Gov. Tompkins when, exercising his extreme prerogative, he prorogued the legislature on March 27, 1812, to prevent the passage of the bill. Though counted among the adherents of the administration of Madison, and though committed to the policy of declaring war against Great Britain, he sided with the Republican members of the New York legislature when in 1812 they determined to break from "the Virginia dynasty" and to support De Witt Clinton for the presidency. In the following year, however, he dissolved his

6 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

political relations with Clinton and resumed the *entente cordiale* with Madison's administration. In 1814 he carried through the legislature an effective war-measure known as "the classification bill," providing for the levy of 12,000 men, to be placed at the disposal of the government for two years. He drew up the resolution of thanks voted by the legislature to Gen. Jackson for the victory of New Orleans. In 1815, while still a member of the state senate, he was appointed attorney-general of the state, superseding the venerable Abraham Van Vechten. In this same year De Witt Clinton, falling a prey to factional rivalries in his own party, was removed by the Albany council from the mayoralty of New York city—an act of petty proscription in which Van Buren sympathized, according to the "spoils system" then in vogue. In 1816 he was re-elected to the state senate for a further term of four years, and, removing to Albany, formed a partnership with his life-long friend, Benjamin F. Butler. In the same year he was appointed a regent of the University of New York. In the legislative discussions of 1816 he advocated the surveys preliminary to Clinton's scheme for uniting the waters of the great lakes with the Hudson.

The election of Gov. Tompkins as vice-president of the United States had left the "Bucktails" of the Republican party without their natural leader.

The people, moreover, in just resentment at the indignity done to Clinton by his removal from the New York mayoralty, were now spontaneously minded to make him governor that he might preside over the execution of the Erie canal which he had projected. Van Buren acquiesced in a drift of opinion that he was powerless to check, and, on the election of Clinton, supported the canal policy; but he soon came to an open rupture with the governor on questions of public patronage, and, arraying himself in active opposition to Clinton's re-election, he was in turn subjected to the proscription of the Albany council acting in Clinton's interest. He was removed from the office of attorney-general in 1819. He opposed the election of Clinton in 1820. Clinton was re-elected by a small majority, but both houses of the legislature and the council of appointment fell into the hands of the anti-Clinton Republicans. The office of attorney-general was now tendered anew to Van Buren, but he declined it. The politics of New York, a mesh of factions from the beginning of the century, were in a constant state of swirl and eddy from 1819 till 1821. The old party-formations were dissolved in the "era of good feeling." What with "Simon-pure" Republicans, Clintonian Republicans, Clintonian Federalists, "high-minded" Federalists cleaving to Monroe, and Federalists pure and simple, the points of crystallization were too many

8 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

to admit of forming a strong or compact body around any centre. No party could combine votes enough in the legislature of 1818-'19 to elect its candidate for U. S. senator. Yet out of this medley of factions and muddle of opinions Van Buren, by his moderation and his genius for political organization, evolved order and harmony at the election for senator in the following year. Under his lead all parties united on Rufus King, a Federalist of the old school, who had patriotically supported the war against Great Britain after it was declared, and who by his candor had won the confidence of President Monroe; and Rufus King was re-elected with practical unanimity at a time when he was fresh from the hot debate in the U. S. senate against the admission of Missouri without a restriction on slavery. His anti-slavery views on that question were held by Van Buren to "conceal no plot" against the Republicans, who, he engaged, would give "a true direction" to that momentous issue. What the "true direction" was to be he did not say, except as it might be inferred from his concurrence in a resolution of the legislature of New York instructing the senators of that state "to oppose the admission, as a state in the Union, of any territory not comprised within the original boundaries of the United States without making the prohibition of slavery therein an indispensable condition of admission." In that Republican reso-

lution of 1820 "the Wilmot proviso" of 1847 appeared above our political horizon, but soon vanished from sight on the passage of the Missouri compromise in 1821.

On February 6, 1821, Van Buren was elected U. S. senator, receiving in both houses of the legislature a majority of twenty-five over Nathan Sanford, the Clintonian candidate, for whom the Federalists also voted. In the same year he was chosen from Otsego county as a member of the convention to revise the constitution of the state. In that convention he met in debate Chancellor Kent, Chief-Justice Ambrose Spencer, and others. Against innovations his attitude was here conservative. He advocated the executive veto. He opposed manhood suffrage, seeking to limit the elective franchise to householders, that this "invaluable right" might not be "cheapened" and that the rural districts might not be overborne by the cities. He favored negro suffrage if negroes were taxed. With offence to party friends, he vehemently resisted the eviction by constitutional change of the existing supreme court, though its members were his bitter political enemies. He opposed an elective judiciary and the choice of minor offices by the people, as swamping the right it pretended to exalt.

He took his seat in the U. S. senate, December 8, 1821, and was at once made a member of its

10 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

committees on the judiciary and finance. For many years he was chairman of the former. In March, 1822, he voted, on the bill to provide a territorial government for Florida, that no slave should be directly or indirectly imported into that territory "except by a citizen removing into it for actual settlement and being at the time a *bona-fide* owner of such slave." Van Buren voted with the northern senators for the retention of this clause; but its exclusion by the vote of the southern senators did not import any countenance to the introduction of slaves into Florida from abroad, as such introduction was already prohibited by a Federal statute which in another part of the bill was extended to Florida. Always averse to imprisonment for debt as the result of misfortune, Van Buren took an early opportunity to advocate its abolition as a feature of Federal jurisprudence. He opposed in 1824 the ratification of the convention with England for the suppression of the slave-trade (perhaps because a qualified right of search was annexed to it), though the convention was urgently pressed on the senate by President Monroe. He supported William H. Crawford for the presidency in 1824, both in the congressional caucus and before the people. He voted for the protective tariff of 1824, and for that of 1828, though he took no part in the discussion of the economic principles underlying either. He voted for the latter under instruc-

tions, maintaining a politic silence as to his personal opinions, which seem to have favored a revenue tariff with incidental protection. He vainly advocated an amendment of the constitution for the election of president by the intervention of an electoral college to be specially chosen from as many separate districts as would comprise the whole country while representing the electoral power of all the states. The measure was designed to appease the jealousy of the small states by practically wiping out state lines in presidential elections and at the same time proposed to guard against elections by the house of representatives, as in case of no choice at a first scrutiny the electoral colleges were to be reconvened. After voting for a few "internal improvements," he opposed them as unconstitutional in the shape then given to them, and proposed in 1824 and again in 1825 to bring them within the power of congress by a constitutional amendment that should protect the "sovereignty of the states" while equally distributing these benefits of the government. In a debate on the Federal judiciary in 1826 he took high ground in favor of "state rights" as against the umpirage of the supreme court on political questions, and deplored the power of that court to arraign sovereign states at its bar for the passage of laws alleged to impair "the obligation of contracts." He confessed admiration for the Republicans of

12 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

1802 who had repealed "the midnight judiciary act." He opposed the Panama mission, and reduced the "Monroe doctrine" to its true historical proportions as a caveat and not a "pledge." On all questions he was strenuous for a "strict construction of the constitution." He favored in 1826 the passage of a general bankrupt law, in opposing the pending measure, sharply accentuated the technical distinction of English law between "bankrupt" and "insolvent" acts—a distinction which, in the complexity of modern business transactions, Chief-Justice Marshall had pronounced to be more metaphysical than real, but which to Van Buren was vital because the constitution says nothing about "insolvent laws."

He was re-elected to the senate in 1827, but soon resigned his seat to accept the office of governor of New York, to which he was elected in 1828. As governor he opposed free banking and advocated the "safety-fund system," making all the banks of the state mutual insurers of each other's soundness. He vainly recommended the policy of separating state from Federal elections. After entering on the office of governor he never resumed the practice of law. Van Buren was a zealous supporter of Andrew Jackson in the presidential election of 1828, and was called in 1829 to be the premier of the new administration. As secretary of state he brought to a favorable close the long-standing feud

between the United States and England with regard to the West India trade. Having an eye to the presidential succession after Jackson's second term, and not wishing meanwhile to compromise the administration or himself, he resigned his secretaryship in June, 1831, and was sent as minister to England. The senate refused in 1832 to confirm his nomination, by the casting-vote of John C. Calhoun, the vice-president. Conscientious Whigs, like Theodore Frelinghuysen, confessed in after days the reluctance with which they consented to this doubtful act. A clause in one of Van Buren's despatches while secretary, containing an invidious reference to the preceding administration, was alleged as the ground of his rejection. The offence was venial, compared with the license taken by Robert R. Livingston when, in negotiating the Louisiana purchase, he cited the spectre of a Federalist administration playing into the hands of "the British faction." Moreover, the pretext was an afterthought, as the clause had excited no remark when first published, and, when the outcry was raised, Jackson "took the responsibility" for it. The tactical blunder of the Whigs soon avenged itself by bringing increased popularity to Van Buren. He became, with Jackson, the symbol of his party, and, elected vice-president in 1832, he came in 1833 to preside over the body which a year before had rejected him as foreign minister. He

14 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

presided with unvarying suavity and fairness. Taking no public part in the envenomed discussions of the time, he was known to sympathize with Jackson in his warfare on the United States bank, and soon came to be generally regarded by his party as the lineal successor of that popular leader.

He was formally nominated for the presidency on May 20, 1835, and was elected in 1836 over his three competitors, William H. Harrison, Hugh L. White, and Daniel Webster, by a majority of 57 in the electoral college, but of only 25,000 in the popular vote. The tide of Jacksonism was beginning to ebb. South Carolina, choosing her electors by state legislature and transferring to Van Buren her hatred of Jackson, voted for Willie P. Mangum. During the canvass Van Buren had been opposed at the north and championed at the south as "a northern man with southern principles." As vice-president, he had in 1835 given a casting-vote for the bill to prohibit the circulation of "incendiary documents" through the mails, and as a candidate for the presidency he had pledged himself to resist the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia without the consent of the slave-states and to oppose the "slightest interference" with slavery in the states. He had also pledged himself against the distribution of surplus revenues among the states, against internal improvements at Federal expense, and against a national bank.

Compelled by the fiscal embarrassments of the government, in the financial crash of 1837, to summon congress to meet in special session, September 4, 1837, he struck in his first message the key-note of his whole administration. After a detailed analysis of the financial situation, and of the causes in trade and speculation that had led to it, he proceeded to develop his favorite idea of an independent treasury for the safe-keeping and disbursement of the public moneys. This idea was not new. It was as old as the constitution. The practice of the government had departed from it only by insensible degrees, until at length, in spite of the protests of Jefferson, it had been consolidated into a formal order of congress that the revenues of the government should be deposited in the United States bank. On the removal of the deposits by Jackson in 1833, they had been placed in the custody of "the pet banks," and had here been used to stimulate private trade and speculation, until the crisis in 1837 necessitated a change of fiscal policy. By every consideration of public duty and safety, conspiring with what he believed to be economic advantage to the people, Van Buren enforced the policy of an independent treasury on a reluctant congress. There was here no bating of breath or mincing of words; but it was not until near the close of his administration that he succeeded in procuring the assent of congress to the

16 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

radical measure that divorced the treasury from private banking and trade. The measure was formally repealed by the Whig congress of 1842, after which the public moneys were again deposited in selected banks until 1846, when the independent treasury was reinstalled and has ever since held its place under all changes of administration. He signed the independent treasury bill on July 4, 1840, as being a sort of "second Declaration of Independence," in his own idea and in that of his party. Von Holst, the sternest of Van Buren's critics, awards to him on "this one question" the credit of "courage, firmness, and statesmanlike insight." It was the *chef d'œuvre* of his public career. He also deserves credit for the fidelity with which, at the evident sacrifice of popularity with a certain class of voters, he adhered to neutral obligations on the outbreak of the Canada rebellion late in 1837.

The administration of Van Buren, beginning and ending with financial panic, went down under the cloud rising on the country in 1840. The enemies and friends of the United States bank had equally sown the wind during Jackson's administration. Van Buren was left to reap the whirlwind, which in the "political hurricane" of 1840 lifted Gen. Harrison into the presidential chair. The Democratic defeat was overwhelming. Harrison received 234 electoral votes, and Van Buren only 60.

The majority for Harrison in the popular vote was nearly 140,000. Retiring after this overthrow to the shades of Lindenwald, a beautiful country-seat which he had purchased in his native county, Van Buren gave no vent to repinings. In 1842 he made a tour through the southern states, visiting Henry Clay at Ashland. In 1843 he came to the front with clear-cut views in favor of a tariff for revenue only. But on the newly emergent question of Texan annexation he took a decided stand in the negative, and on this rock of offence to the southern wing of his party his candidature was wrecked in the Democratic national convention of 1844, which met at Baltimore on May 27. He refused to palter with this issue, on the ground of our neutral obligations to Mexico, and when the nomination went to James K. Polk, of Tennessee, he gave no sign of resentment. His friends brought to Polk a loyal support, and secured his election by carrying for him the decisive vote of the State of New York.

Van Buren continued to take an interest in public affairs, and, when in 1847 the acquisition of new territory from Mexico raised anew the vexed question of slavery in the territories, he gave in his adhesion to the "Wilmot proviso." In the new elective affinities produced by this "burning question" a redistribution of political elements took place in the chaos of New York politics. The "Barnburner" and the "Hunker" factions came to

18 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

a sharp cleavage on this line of division. The former declared their "uncompromising hostility to the extension of slavery." In the Herkimer Democratic convention of October 26, 1847, the Free-soil banner was openly displayed, and delegates were sent to the Democratic national convention. From this convention, assembled at Baltimore in May, 1848, the Herkimer delegates seceded before any presidential nomination was made. In June, 1848, a Barnburner convention met at Utica to organize resistance to the nomination of Gen. Lewis Cass, who, in his "Nicholson letter," had disavowed the "Wilmot proviso." To this convention Van Buren addressed a letter, declining in advance a nomination for the presidency, but pledging opposition to the new party shibboleth. In spite of his refusal, he was nominated, and this nomination was reaffirmed by the Freesoil national convention of Buffalo, August 9, 1848, when Charles Francis Adams was associated with him as candidate for the vice-presidency. In the ensuing presidential election this ticket received only 291,263 votes, but, as the result of the triangular duel, Gen. Cass was defeated and Gen Zachary Taylor, the Whig candidate, was elected. The precipitate annexation of Texas and its natural sequel, the war with Mexico, had brought their Nemesis in the utter confusion of national politics. Van Buren received no electoral votes, but his

1842

I have some friends to
dine with me at five to
day & will be happy to
have the pleasure of your
company.

Do me the additional
honor to bring Mr Bonker
with you.

Yours truly
Martin Van Buren
Mr Halleck
Saturday Feb 20

[Fac-simile letter from Martin Van Buren to Fitz-Greene Halleck]

popular Democratic vote in Massachusetts, Vermont, and New York exceeded that of Cass. Henceforth he was simply a spectator in the political arena. On all public questions save that of slavery he remained an unfaltering Democrat, and, when it was fondly supposed that "the slavery issue" had been forever exorcised by the compromise measures of 1850, he returned in full faith and communion to his old party allegiance. In 1852 he began to write his "Inquiry into the Origin and Course of Political Parties in the United States" (New York, 1867), but it was never finished and was published as a fragment. He supported Franklin Pierce for the presidency in 1852, and, after spending two years in Europe, returned in time to vote for James Buchanan in 1856. In 1860 he voted for the combined electoral ticket against Lincoln, but when the civil war began he gave to the administration his zealous support.

Van Buren was the target of political accusation during his whole public career, but kept his private character free from reproach. In his domestic life he was as happy as he was exemplary. Always prudent in his habits and economical in his tastes, he none the less maintained in his style of living the easy state of a gentleman, whether in public station at Albany and Washington, or at Lindenswald in his retirement. A man of the world he was singularly affable and courteous, blending

20 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

formal deference with natural dignity and genuine cordiality. Intensely partisan in his opinions and easily startled by the red rag of "Hamiltonian Federalism," he never carried the contentions of the political arena into the social sphere. The asperities of personal rivalry estranged him for a time from Calhoun, after the latter denounced him in the senate in 1837 as "a practical politician," with whom "justice, right, patriotism, etc., were mere vague phrases," but with his great Whig rival, Henry Clay, he maintained unbroken relations of friendship through all vicissitudes of political fortune. As a lawyer his rank was eminent. Though never rising in speech to the heights of oratory, he was equally fluent and facile before bench or jury, and equally felicitous whether expounding the intricacies of fact or of law in a case. His manner was mild and insinuating, never declamatory. Without carrying his judicial studies into the realm of jurisprudence, he yet had a knowledge of law that fitted him to cope with the greatest advocates of the New York bar. The evidences of his legal learning and acute dialectics are still preserved in the New York reports of Cowen, Johnson, and Wendell. As a debater in the senate, he always went to the pith of questions, disdaining the arts of rhetoric. As a writer of political letters or of state papers, he carried ~~down~~ usiveness to a fault, which sometimes hinted at weakness in positions requir-

ing so much defence. As a politician he was masterful in leadership—so much so that, alike by friends and foes, he was credited with reducing its practices to a fine art.

He was a member of the famous Albany regency which for so many years controlled the politics of New York, and was long popularly known as its “director.” Fertile in the contrivance of means for the attainment of the public ends which he deemed desirable, he was called “the little magician,” from the deftness of his touch in politics. But, combining the statesman’s foresight with the politician’s tact, he showed his sagacity rather by seeking a majority for his views than by following the views of a majority. Accused of “non-committalism,” and with some show of reason in the early stages of his career, it was only as to men and minor measures of policy that he practised a prudent reticence. On questions of deeper principle—an elective judiciary, negro suffrage, universal suffrage, etc.—he boldly took the unpopular side. In a day of unexampled political giddiness he stood firmly for his subtreasury system against the doubts of friends, the assaults of enemies, and the combined pressure of wealth and culture in the country. Dispensing patronage according to the received custom of his times, he yet maintained a high standard of appointment. That he could rise above selfish considerations was shown when he promoted the

22 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

elevation of Rufus King in 1820, or when he strove in 1838 to bring Washington Irving into his cabinet with small promise of gain to his doubtful political fortunes by such an "unpractical" appointment. As a statesman he had his compact fagot of opinions, to which he adhered in evil or good report. It might seem that the logic of his principles in 1848, combined with the subsequent drift of events, should have landed him in the Free-soil party that Abraham Lincoln led to victory in 1860; but it is to be remembered that, while Van Buren's political opinions were in a fluid state, they had been cast in the doctrinal moulds of Jefferson, and had there taken rigid form and pressure. In the natural history of American party-formations he supposed that an enduring antithesis had always been discernible between the "money power" and the "farming interest" of the land. In his annual message of December, 1838, holding language very modern in its emphasis, he counted "the anti-republican tendencies of associated wealth" as among the strains that had been put upon our government. This is indeed the main thesis of his "Inquiry," a book which is more an *apologia* than a history. In that chronicle of his life-long antipathy to a splendid consolidated government, with its imperial judiciary, funding systems, high tariffs, and internal improvements—the whole surmounted by a powerful national bank as the "regulator"

of finance and politics—he has left an outlined sketch of the only dramatic unity that can be found for his eventful career.


Confessing in 1848 that he had gone further in concession to slavery than many of his friends at the north had approved, he satisfied himself with a formal protest against the repeal of the Missouri compromise, carried through congress while he was travelling in Europe, and against the policy of making the Dred Scott decision a rule of Democratic politics, though he thought the decision sound in point of technical law. With these reservations, avowedly made in the interest of “strict construction” and of “old-time Republicanism” rather than of Free-soil or National reformation, he maintained his allegiance to the party with which his fame was identified, and which he was perhaps the more unwilling to leave because of the many sacrifices he had made in its service. The biography of Van Buren has been written by William H. Holland (Hartford, 1835); Francis J. Grund (in German, 1835); William Emmons (Washington, 1835); David Crockett (Philadelphia, 1836); William L. Mackenzie (Boston, 1846); William Allen Butler (New York, 1862); and Edward M. Shepard (Boston, 1888). Mackenzie’s book is compiled in part from surreptitious letters, shedding a lurid light on the “practical politics” of the times. Butler’s sketch was published immediately

24 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

after the ex-president's death. Shepa's biography is written with adequate learning and in philosophical spirit, which may also be said of a brief and appreciative biography that appeared from the practised pen of the venerable historian of the United States, in his ninetieth year entitled "Martin Van Buren to the End of his Public Career, by George Bancroft" (New York 1889).

His wife, HANNAH, born in Kinderhook N. Y., in 1782; died in Albany, N. Y., February 5, 1819, was of Dutch descent, and her maiden name was Hoes. She was educated in the schools of her native village, and was the classmate of Mr. Van Buren, whom she married in 1807. She was devoted to her domestic cares and duties, and took little interest in social affairs, but was greatly beloved by the poor. When Mrs. Van Buren learned that she could live but a few days, she expressed a desire that her funeral be conducted with the utmost simplicity, and the money that would otherwise have been devoted to mourning emblems be given to the poor and needy.

Their son, ABRAHAM, soldier, born in Kinderhook, N. Y., November 27, 1807; died in New York city, March 15, 1873, was graduated at the U. S. military academy in 1827, and attached to the 2d infantry as 2d lieutenant. He served for



LINDENWALD, KINDERHOOK, N. Y., THE HOME OF MARTIN VAN BUREN

two years on the western frontier, and for the next seven years as aide-de-camp to the general-in-chief, Alexander Macomb, except during several months in 1836, when he accompanied Gen. Winfield Scott as a volunteer aide in the expedition against the Seminole Indians. He was commissioned as a captain in the 1st dragoons on July 4, 1836, resigning on March 3, 1837, to become his father's private secretary. He brought daily reports of the proceedings of congress to President Van Buren, who was often influenced by his suggestions. At the beginning of the war with Mexico he re-entered the army as major and paymaster, his commission dating from June 26, 1846. He served on the staff of Gen. Zachary Taylor at Monterey, and subsequently joined the staff of Gen. Scott as a volunteer, and participated in every engagement from Vera Cruz to the capture of the city of Mexico, being brevetted lieutenant-colonel for bravery at Contreras and Churubusco on August 20, 1847. He served in the paymaster's department after the war till June 1, 1854, when he again resigned, after which he resided for a part of the time in Columbia, S. C. (where his wife inherited a plantation), till 1859, and afterward for fourteen years leading a life of leisure in New York City.

Another son, JOHN, lawyer, born in Hudson, N. Y., February 18, 1810; died at sea October 13,

26 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

1866, was graduated at Yale in 1828, studied law with Benjamin F. Butler, and was admitted to the bar at Albany in 1830. In the following year he accompanied his father to London as an attaché of the legation. In February, 1845, he was elected attorney-general of the state of New York, serving till December 31, 1846. He took an active part in the political canvass of 1848 as an advocate of the exclusion of slavery from the territories, but did not remain with the Free-soil party in its later developments. He held high rank as a lawyer, appearing in the Edwin Forrest and many other important cases, was an eloquent pleader, and an effective political speaker. He died on the voyage from Liverpool to New York. He was popularly known as "Prince John" * after his travels

* Walking in Broadway with Fitz-Greene Halleck the year before the war, he exclaimed, "Ah! there's Little Van and Prince John!" when I saw approaching arm-in-arm the silvery-haired ex-president and his handsome son. The former was among the smallest, physically, of our chief magistrates, and it was a constant delight to his political opponents to designate him as "Little Van." In this respect, however, he in no way differed from the other twenty-two presidents, who without exception were labelled with more or less inimical or popular nicknames. Washington was called the "Father of his Country" and the "American Fabius"; John Adams, the "Colossus of Independence"; Jefferson, the "Sage of Monticello," and "Long Tom" by his political opponents; Madison, "Father of the Constitution"; Monroe, "Last Cocked Hat," from the circumstance of his being the last of the revolutionary presidents to wear the cocked hat of that period; John Quincy Adams, the "Old Man Eloquent"; Jackson, the "Hero of New Orleans" and "Old Hickory"; Van Buren, the "Little Magician," in allusion to his political sagacity and astuteness, "King Martin the First," and "Little Van"; Harrison, the "Washington of

abroad during his father's presidency, was tall and handsome, of elegant manners and appearance, a charming conversationalist, and an admirable *raconteur*.

the West" and "Old Tippecanoe"; Tyler, "Accidental President"; Polk, "Young Hickory," so christened by his admiring adherents of the presidential campaign; Taylor, "Rough and Ready" and "Old Zach"; Fillmore, the "American Louis Philippe," owing to his dignified, courteous manners and supposed resemblance to the French king; Pierce, "Poor Pierce," pronounced *Purse*; Buchanan, "Old Public Functionary" and "Old Buck"; Lincoln, "Honest Old Abe" and "Father Abraham," used in the famous war-song, "We're coming, Father Abraham, three hundred thousand strong"; Johnson, "Sir Veto" and the "Tailor President"; Grant, "Unconditional Surrender," and by his political adversaries the "American Cæsar," in allusion to his third-term candidacy and their claim that Grantism was a synonym of Cæsarism; Hayes, "President *de facto*"; Garfield, the "Teacher President" and "Martyr President"; Arthur, "The First Gentleman in the Land," and by his New York admirers "Our Chet," a contraction of Chester; Cleveland, the "Man of Destiny" and "Old Grover"; and Benjamin Harrison, "Backbone Ben" and the "Son of his Grandfather," the latter's hat being a conspicuous object in the campaign cartoons of 1888 and afterward. Kinley in McKinley stands in Gaelic for "the man with the glad countenance," his popular name, and a happy coincidence in the case of William McKinley. His successor was familiarly and universally known as "Teddy."

At the Broadway meeting referred to the poet mentioned a pleasant visit to Van Buren at Lindenwald, where he had met Washington Irving, and that the latter had written the concluding chapters of his "History of New York" when in retirement there for two months after the death of his betrothed, Miss Matilda Hoffman. At that time (1809) it was the estate of Irving's intimate friend, William P. Van Ness, an eminent lawyer and jurist, who acted as Burr's second in his duel with Hamilton. The ex-president purchased the property, Halleck informed me, from the heirs of Judge Van Ness, and incidentally remarked that he had seen all the presidents except Washington, and had known most of them. The poet also alluded to the circumstance of Irving having been offered by President Van Buren the portfolio of the secretary of the navy, which, on his declining its acceptance, was conferred on the amiable author's friend

28 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

Abraham's wife, ANGELICA, born in Sumter District, S. C., about 1820; died in New York city, December 29, 1878, was a daughter of Richard Singleton, a planter, and a cousin of William C. Preston and of Mrs. James Madison, who, while her kinswoman was completing her education in Philadelphia, presented her to President Van Buren. A year later she married Maj. Van Buren, in November, 1838, and on the following New-Year's-day she made her first appearance as mistress of the White House. With her husband she visited England (where her uncle, Andrew Stevenson, was U. S. minister) and other countries of Europe, in the spring of 1839, returning in the autumn to resume her place as hostess of the presidential mansion.

and literary partner, James K. Paulding. Halleck on several occasions introduced the name of Van Buren in his poems, and in "Fanny," which first appeared in 1819, he remarks:

"What, Egypt, was thy magic, to the tricks
Of Mr. Charles, Judge Spencer, or Van Buren?
The first with cards, the last in politics,
A conjurer's fame for years has been securing."

—EDITOR.

WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

BY


ARTHUR E. BOSTWICK

WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, ninth president of the United States, born in Berkeley, Charles City County, Va., February 9, 1773; died in Washington, D. C., April 4, 1841, was the third and youngest son of Benjamin Harrison, signer of the Declaration of Independence, born in Berkeley, Charles City County, Va., about 1740; died in April, 1791. He was a descendant of Colonel John Harrison, a distinguished officer during the civil wars of England, and one of the judges who tried and condemned the unfortunate Charles the First, for which, and for his active participation in the affairs of the commonwealth under Cromwell, he was himself tried and executed after the restoration. As a member of the burgesses in 1764 he served on the committee that prepared the memorials to the king, lords, and commons; but in 1765, with many other prominent men, opposed the stamp act resolutions of Henry as impolitic. He was chosen in 1773 one of the committee of correspondence which united the colonies against Great Britain in 1774, appointed one of the delegates to congress, and four times re-elected to a

32 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

seat in that body. As a member of all the Virginia conventions to organize resistance, he acted with the party led by Pendleton in favor of "general united opposition." On June 10, 1776, as chairman of the committee of the whole house of congress, he introduced the resolution that had been offered three days before by Richard Henry Lee, declaring the independence of the American colonies, and on July 4 he reported the Declaration of Independence, of which he was one of the signers. On his return from congress he became a member of the Virginia house of delegates under the new constitution, was chosen speaker, filling that office until 1781, when he was twice elected governor of the commonwealth. As a delegate to the Virginia convention of 1788, he opposed the ratification of the Federal constitution, taking the ground of Patrick Henry, James Monroe, and others, that it was a national and not a Federal government, though when the instrument was adopted he gave it his hearty support. At the time of his death he was a member of the Virginia legislature. In person Benjamin Harrison was large and fleshy; and, in spite of his suffering from gout, of unfailing good humor. Although without conspicuous intellectual endowments, he was a man of excellent judgment and the highest sense of honor, with a courage and cheerfulness that never faltered, and a "downright candor" and sincerity



W H Harrison

From a portrait in the possession of Bettie Harrison Eaton, North Bend, Ohio.

of character which conciliated the affection and respect of all who knew him.

William Henry was educated at Hampden Sidney college, Virginia, and began the study of medicine, but before he had finished it accounts of the Indian outrages that had been committed on the western frontier raised in him a desire to enter the army for its defence. Robert Morris, who had been appointed his guardian on the death of his father in 1791, endeavored to dissuade him, but his purpose being approved by Washington, who had been his father's friend, he was commissioned ensign in the 1st infantry on August 16, 1791. He joined his regiment at Fort Washington, Ohio, was appointed lieutenant of the 1st sub-legion, to rank from June, 1792, and afterward united with the army under Gen. Anthony Wayne. Being made aide-de-camp to the commanding officer, he took part, in December, 1793, in the expedition that erected Fort Recovery on the battle field where St. Clair had been defeated two years before, and, with others, received thanks by name in general orders for his services. He participated in the engagements with the Indians that began on June 30, 1794, and on August 19, at a council of war, submitted a plan of march, which was adopted and led to the victory on the Miami on the following day.

Lieut. Harrison was specially complimented by

34 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

Gen. Wayne, in his despatch to the secretary of war, for gallantry in this fight, and in May, 1797, was made captain, and given command of Fort Washington. Here he was intrusted with the duty of receiving and forwarding troops, arms, and provisions to the forts in the northwest that had been evacuated by the British in obedience to the Jay treaty of 1794, and also instructed to report to the commanding general on all movements in the south, and to prevent the passage of French agents with military stores intended for an invasion of Louisiana. While in command of this fort he formed an attachment for Anna, youngest daughter of John Cleves Symmes, one of the judges of the northwest territory, and the founder of the Miami settlement in Ohio. Peace having been made with the Indians, Capt. Harrison resigned his commission on June 1, 1798, and was immediately appointed by President John Adams secretary of the northwest territory, under Gen. Arthur St. Clair as governor, but in October, 1799, resigned to take his seat as territorial delegate in congress. In his one year of service, though he was opposed by speculators, he secured the subdivision of the public lands into small tracts and the passage of other measures for the welfare of the settlers.

During the session, part of the northwest territory was formed into the territory of Indiana, including the present states of Indiana, Illinois,

Michigan, and Wisconsin, and Harrison was made its governor and superintendent of Indian affairs. Resigning his seat in congress, he entered on the duties of his office, which included the confirmation of land-grants, the defining of townships, and others that were equally important. Gov. Harrison was reappointed successively by President Jefferson and President Madison. He organized the legislature at Vincennes in 1805, and applied himself especially to improving the condition of the Indians, trying to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors among them, and to introduce inoculation for the small-pox. He frequently held councils with them, and, although his life was sometimes endangered, succeeded by his calmness and courage in averting many outbreaks. On September 30, 1809, he concluded a treaty with several tribes by which they sold to the United States about 3,000,000 acres of land on Wabash and White rivers. This, and the former treaties of cession that had been made, were condemned by Tecumseh and other chiefs on the ground that the consent of all the tribes was necessary to a legal sale. The discontent was increased by the action of speculators in ejecting Indians from the lands, by agents of the British government, and by the preaching of Tecumseh's brother, the "prophet," and it was evident that an outbreak was at hand. The governor pursued a conciliatory course, gave

36 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

to needy Indians provisions from the public stores, and in July, 1810, invited Tecumseh and his brother, the prophet, to a council at Vincennes, requesting them to bring with them not more than thirty men. In response, the chief, accompanied by 400 fully armed warriors, arrived at Vincennes on August 12. The council, held under the trees in front of the governor's house, was nearly terminated by bloodshed on the first day, but Harrison, who foresaw the importance of conciliating Tecumseh, prevented, by his coolness, a conflict that almost had been precipitated by the latter. The discussion was resumed on the next day, but with no result, the Indians insisting on the return of all the lands that had recently been acquired by treaty. On the day after the council Harrison visited Tecumseh at his camp, accompanied only by an interpreter, but without success.

In the following spring depredations by the savages were frequent, and the governor sent word to Tecumseh that, unless they should cease, the Indians would be punished. The chief promised another interview, and appeared at Vincennes on July 27, 1811, with 300 followers, but, awed probably by the presence of 750 militia, professed to be friendly. Soon afterward, Harrison, convinced of the chief's insincerity, but not approving the plan of the government to seize him as a hostage, proposed, instead, the establishment of a

military post near Tippecanoe, a town that had been established by the prophet on the upper Wabash. The news that the government had given assent to this scheme was received with joy, and volunteers flocked to Vincennes. Harrison marched from that town on September 26 with about 900 men, including 350 regular infantry, completed Fort Harrison, near the site of Terre Haute, Ind., on October 28, and, leaving a garrison there, pressed forward toward Tippecanoe. On November 6, when the army had reached a point a mile and a half distant from the town, it was met by messengers demanding a parley. A council being proposed for the next day, Harrison at once went into camp, taking, however, every precaution against a surprise. At four o'clock on the following morning a fierce attack was made on the camp by the savages, and the fighting continued till daylight, when the Indians were driven from the field by a cavalry charge. During the battle, in which the American loss was 108 killed and wounded, the governor directed the movements of the troops. He was highly complimented by President Madison in his message of December 18, 1811, and also received the thanks of the legislatures of Kentucky and Indiana.

On June 18, 1812, war was declared between Great Britain and the United States. On August 25, Gov. Harrison, although not a citizen of Ken-

38 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

tucky, was commissioned major-general of the militia of that state, and given command of a detachment that was sent to re-enforce Gen. William Hull, the news of whose surrender had not yet reached Kentucky. On September 2, while on the march, he received a brigadier-general's commission in the regular army, but withheld his acceptance till he could learn whether or not he was to be subordinate to Gen. James Winchester, who had been appointed to the command of the northwestern army. After relieving Fort Wayne, which had been invested by the Indians, he turned over his force to Gen. Winchester, and was returning to his home in Indiana when he met an express with a letter from the secretary of war, appointing him to the chief command in the northwest. "You will exercise," said the letter, "your own discretion, and act in all cases according to your own judgment." No latitude as great as this had been given to any commander since Washington. Harrison now prepared to concentrate his force on the rapids of the Maumee, and thence to move on Malden and Detroit. Various difficulties, however, prevented him from carrying out his design immediately. Forts were erected and supplies forwarded, but, with the exception of a few minor engagements with Indians, the remainder of the year was occupied merely in preparation for the coming campaign. Winchester had been ordered

by Harrison to advance to the rapids, but the order was countermanded on receipt of information that Tecumseh, with a large force, was at the headwaters of the Wabash. Through a misunderstanding, however, Winchester continued, and on January 18 captured Frenchtown (now Monroe, Mich.), but three days later met with a bloody repulse on the river Raisin from Col. Henry Proctor. Harrison hastened to his aid, but was too late. After establishing a fortified camp, which he named Fort Meigs, after the governor of Ohio, the commander visited Cincinnati to obtain supplies, and while there urged the construction of a fleet on Lake Erie. On March 2, 1813, he was given a major-general's commission. Shortly afterward, having heard that the British were preparing to attack Fort Meigs, he hastened thither, arriving on April 12. On April 28 it was ascertained that the enemy under Proctor was advancing in force, and on May 1 siege was laid to the fort. While a heavy fire was kept up on both sides for five days, re-enforcements under Gen. Green Clay were hurried forward and came to the relief of the Americans in two bodies, one on each side of Maumee river. Those on the opposite side from the fort put the enemy to flight, but, disregarding Harrison's signals, allowed themselves to be drawn into the woods, and were finally dispersed or captured. The other detachment fought their way to the fort,

40 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

and at the same time the garrison made a sortie and spiked the enemy's guns. Three days later Proctor raised the siege. He renewed his attack in July with 5,000 men, but after a few days again withdrew.

On September 10 Com. Oliver H. Perry gained his victory on Lake Erie, and on September 16 Harrison embarked his artillery and supplies for a descent on Canada. The troops followed between the 20th and 24th, and on the 27th the army landed on the enemy's territory. Proctor burned the fort and navy-yard at Malden and retreated, and Harrison followed on the next day. Proctor was overtaken on October 5, and took position with his left flanked by the Thames, and a swamp covering his right, which was still further protected by Tecumseh and his Indians. He had made the mistake of forming his men in open order, which was the plan that was adopted in Indian fighting, and Harrison, taking advantage of the error, ordered Col. Richard M. Johnson to lead a cavalry charge, which broke through the British lines, and virtually ended the battle. Within five minutes almost the entire British force was captured, and Proctor escaped only by abandoning his carriage and taking to the woods. Another band of cavalry charged the Indians, who lost their leader, Tecumseh, in the beginning of the fight, and afterward made no great resistance. This battle, which,

Seventh Chamber
22.~ May 1826.

Dear Sir

The nomination James Barbour
minister to London & myself to Columbia have
this day been made - unanimously - I have already been
wide prop unanimously. I have already been
told so by a majority of the Senate. To those
you can include any can present with the
Sellers your in haste
W^m Harrison

D. K. Eschey

if mere numbers alone be considered, was insignificant, was most important in its results. Together with Perry's victory it gave the United States possession of the chain of lakes above Erie, and put an end to the war in uppermost Canada. Harrison's praises were sung in the president's message, in congress, and in the legislatures of the different states. Celebrations in honor of his victory were held in the principal cities of the Union, and he was one of the heroes of the hour. He now sent his troops to Niagara, and proceeded to Washington, where he was ordered by the president to Cincinnati to devise means of protection for the Indiana border.

Gen. John Armstrong, who was at this time secretary of war, in planning the campaign of 1814 assigned Harrison to the 8th military district, including only western states, where he could see no active service, and on April 25 issued an order to Maj. Holmes, one of Harrison's subordinates, without consulting the latter. Harrison thereupon tendered his resignation, which, President Madison being absent, was accepted by Armstrong. This terminated Harrison's military career. In 1814, and again in 1815, he was appointed on commissions that concluded satisfactory Indian treaties, and in 1816 chosen to congress to fill a vacancy, serving till 1819. While in congress he was charged by a dissatisfied contractor with misuse of

the public money when in command of the north-western army, but was completely exonerated by an investigating committee of the house. At this time his opponents succeeded, by a vote of 13 to 11 in the senate, in striking his name from a resolution that had already passed the house, directing gold medals to be struck in honor of Gov. Shelby, of Kentucky, and himself, for the victory of the Thames. The resolution was passed unanimously two years later, on March 24, 1818, and Harrison received the medal. Among the charges made against him was this one, that he would not have pursued Proctor at all, after the latter's abandonment of Malden, had it not been for Gov. Shelby; but the latter denied it in a letter read before the senate, and gave Gen. Harrison the highest praise for his promptitude and vigilance. While in congress, Harrison drew up and advocated a general militia bill, which was not successful, and also proposed an admirable measure for the relief of soldiers, which was passed.

In 1819 Gen. Harrison was chosen to the senate of Ohio, and in 1822 was a candidate for congress, but was defeated on account of his vote against the admission of Missouri to the Union with the restriction that slavery should be prohibited there. In 1824 he was a presidential elector, voting for Henry Clay, and in the same year sent to the U. S. senate, where he succeeded Andrew Jack-

son as chairman of the committee on military affairs, introduced a bill to prevent desertions, and exerted himself to obtain pensions for old soldiers. He resigned in 1828, having been appointed by President John Quincy Adams U. S. minister to the United States of Colombia. While there he wrote a letter to Gen. Simon Bolivar urging him not to accept dictatorial powers. He was recalled at the outset of Jackson's administration, as is asserted by some, at the demand of Gen. Bolivar, and retired to his farm at North Bend, near Cincinnati, Ohio, where he lived quietly, filling the offices of clerk of the county court and president of the county agricultural society. In 1835 Gen. Harrison was nominated for the presidency by meetings in Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, and other states; but the opposition to Van Buren was not united on him, and he received only 73 electoral votes to the former's 170. Four years later the National Whig convention, which was called at Harrisburg, Pa., for December 4, 1839, to decide between the claims of several rival candidates, nominated him for the same office, with John Tyler, of Virginia, for vice-president. The Democrats renominated President Van Buren.

The canvass that followed has been often called the "Log-cabin and hard-cider campaign." The eastern end of Gen. Harrison's house at North Bend consisted of a log-cabin that had been built

44 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

by one of the first settlers of Ohio, but which had long since been covered with clapboards. The republican simplicity of his home was extolled by his admirers, and a political biography of that time says that "his table, instead of being covered with exciting wines, is well supplied with the best cider." Log-cabins and hard cider, then, became the party emblems, and both were features of all the political demonstrations of the canvass, which witnessed the introduction of the enormous mass-meetings and processions that have since been common just before presidential elections. The result of the contest was the choice of Harrison, who received 234 electoral votes to Van Buren's 60. He was inaugurated at Washington on March 4, 1841, and immediately sent to the senate his nominations for cabinet officers, which were confirmed. They were Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, secretary of state; Thomas Ewing, of Ohio, secretary of the treasury; John Bell, of Tennessee, secretary of war; George E. Badger, of North Carolina, secretary of the navy; Francis Granger, of New York, post-master-general; and John J. Crittenden, of Kentucky, attorney-general. The senate adjourned on March 15, and two days afterward the president called congress together in extra session to consider financial measures. On March 27, after several days of indisposition, he was prostrated by a

chill, which was followed by bilious pneumonia, and on Sunday morning, April 4, he died.

Amid the shadows of approaching death, he imagined he was addressing his successor, and exclaimed: "Sir, I wish you to understand the principles of the government. I desire them carried out. I ask nothing more." The end came so suddenly that his wife, who had remained at North Bend on account of illness, was unable to be present at his death-bed. The event was a shock to the country, the more so that a chief magistrate had never before died in office, and especially to the Whig party, who had formed high hopes of his administration. His body was interred in the congressional cemetery at Washington; but on July 7 of the same year, at the request of his family, removed to North Bend, where it was placed in a tomb overlooking the Ohio river. This was subsequently allowed to fall into neglect, and afterward Gen. Harrison's son, John Scott, offered it and the surrounding land to the state of Ohio, on condition that it should be kept in repair. Several unsuccessful efforts have been made to induce the state to raise money by taxation for the purpose of erecting a monument to Gen. Harrison's memory. "He was not," it has been said, "a great man, but he had lived in a great time, and had been a leader in great things." Harrison's inaugural address is the longest ever delivered by any of our

46 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

presidents (the shortest is Washington's second address, consisting of but 134 words, while Harrison's is 8,578), and he was also the author of a "Discourse on the Aborigines of the Valley of the Ohio" (Cincinnati, 1838). His life has been written by Moses Dawson (Cincinnati, 1834); by James Hall (Philadelphia, 1836); by Richard Hildreth (1839); by Samuel J. Burr (New York, 1840); by Isaac R. Jackson; and by Henry Montgomery (New York, 1853).

His wife, ANNA, born near Morristown, N. J., July 25, 1775; died near North Bend, Ohio, February 25, 1864, was a daughter of John Cleves Symmes, and married Gen. Harrison November 22, 1795. After her husband's death she lived at North Bend till 1855, when she went to the house of her son, John Scott Harrison, a few miles distant. Her funeral sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Horace Bushnell, and her body lies by the side of her husband at North Bend.

Their son, JOHN SCOTT, born in Vincennes, Ind., October 4, 1804; died near North Bend, Ohio, May 26, 1878, received a liberal education, and was elected to congress as a Whig, serving from December 5, 1853, till March 3, 1857. His third son, Benjamin, became the twenty-third president of the United States.

A daughter, **LUCY**, born in Richmond, Va., in 1798; died in Cincinnati, Ohio, April 7, 1826, became the wife of **David K. Este**, an eminent lawyer and jurist of the latter city, and was noted for her piety and benevolence.

JOHN TYLER

BY

JOHN FISKE

JOHN TYLER

JOHN TYLER, tenth president of the United States, born at Greenway, Charles City County, Va., March 29, 1790; died in Richmond, Va., January 18, 1862. He was the second son of Judge John Tyler and Mary Armistead. In early boyhood he attended the small school kept by John McMurdo, who was so diligent in his use of the birch that in later years Mr. Tyler said "it was a wonder he did not whip all the sense out of his scholars." At the age of eleven young Tyler was one of the ring-leaders in a rebellion in which the despotic McMurdo was overpowered by numbers, tied hand and foot, and left locked up in the school-house until late at night, when a passing traveller effected an entrance and released him. On complaining to Judge Tyler, the indignant schoolmaster was met with the apt reply, "*Sic semper tyrannis!*" The future president was graduated at William and Mary in 1807. At college he showed a strong interest in ancient history. He was also fond of poetry and music, and, like Thomas Jefferson, was a skilful performer on the violin. In 1809 he was admitted to the bar, and

52 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

had already begun to obtain a good practice when he was elected to the legislature, and took his seat in that body in December, 1811. He was here a firm supporter of Mr. Madison's administration, and the war with Great Britain, which soon followed, afforded him an opportunity to become conspicuous as a forcible and persuasive orator. One of his earliest public acts is especially interesting in view of the famous struggle with the Whigs, which in later years he conducted as president. The charter of the first Bank of the United States, established in 1791, was to expire in twenty years; and in 1811 the question of renewing the charter came before congress. The bank was very unpopular in Virginia, and the assembly of that state, by a vote of 125 to 35, instructed its senators at Washington, Richard Brent and William B. Giles, to vote against a recharter. The instructions denounced the bank as an institution in the founding of which congress had exceeded its powers and grossly violated state rights. Yet there were many in congress who, without approving the principle upon which the bank was founded, thought the eve of war an inopportune season for making a radical change in the financial system of the nation. Of the two Virginia senators, Brent voted in favor of the recharter, and Giles spoke on the same side, and although, in obedience to instructions, he voted contrary to his own opinion, he did so under pro-



John Tyler

From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C.

test. On January 14, 1812, Mr. Tyler, in the Virginia legislature, introduced resolutions of censure, in which the senators were taken to task, while the Virginia doctrines, as to the unconstitutional character of the bank and the binding force of instructions, were formally asserted.

Mr. Tyler married, March 29, 1813, Letitia, daughter of Robert Christian, and a few weeks afterward was called into the field at the head of a company of militia to take part in the defence of Richmond and its neighborhood, now threatened by the British. This military service lasted for a month, during which Mr. Tyler's company was not called into action. He was re-elected to the legislature annually, until in November, 1816, he was chosen to fill a vacancy in the U. S. house of representatives. In the regular election to the next congress, out of 220 votes given in his native county, he received all but one. As a member of congress he soon made himself conspicuous as a strict constructionist. When Mr. Calhoun introduced his bill in favor of internal improvements, Mr. Tyler voted against it. He opposed the bill for changing the *per diem* allowance of members of congress to an annual salary of \$1,500. He opposed, as premature, Mr. Clay's proposal to add to the general appropriation bill a provision for \$18,000 for a minister to the provinces of the La Plata, thus committing the United States to a

recognition of the independence of those revolted provinces. He also voted against the proposal for a national bankrupt act. He condemned, as arbitrary and insubordinate, the course of Gen. Jackson in Florida, and contributed an able speech to the long debate over the question as to censuring that gallant commander. He was a member of a committee for inquiring into the affairs of the national bank, and his most elaborate speech was in favor of Mr. Trimble's motion to issue a *scire facias* against that institution. On all three points Mr. Tyler's course seems to have pleased his constituents; in the spring election of 1819 he did not consider it necessary to issue the usual circular address, or in any way to engage in a personal canvass. He simply distributed copies of his speech against the bank, and was re-elected to congress unanimously.

The most important question that came before the 16th congress related to the admission of Missouri to the Union. In the debates over this question Mr. Tyler took ground against the imposition of any restrictions upon the extension of slavery. At the same time he declared himself on principle opposed to the perpetuation of slavery, and he sought to reconcile these positions by the argument that in diffusing the slave population over a wide area the evils of the institution would be diminished and the prospects of ultimate emancipation in-

creased. "Slavery," said he, "has been represented on all hands as a dark cloud, and the candor of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Whitman] drove him to the admission that it would be well to disperse this cloud. In this sentiment I entirely concur with him. How can you otherwise disarm it? Will you suffer it to increase in its darkness over one particular portion of this land till its horrors shall burst upon it? Will you permit the lightnings of its wrath to break upon the south, when by the interposition of a wise system of legislation you may reduce it to a summer's cloud?" New York and Pennsylvania, he argued, had been able to emancipate their slaves only by reducing their number by exportation. Dispersion, moreover, would be likely to ameliorate the condition of the black man, for by making his labor scarce in each particular locality it would increase the demand for it and would thus make it the interest of the master to deal fairly and generously with his slaves. To the objection that the increase of the slave population would fully keep up with its territorial expansion, he replied by denying that such would be the case. His next argument was that if an old state, such as Virginia, could have slaves, while a new state, such as Missouri, was to be prevented by Federal authority from having them, then the old and new states would at once be placed upon a different footing, which was contrary to the spirit

of the constitution. If congress could thus impose one restriction upon a state, where was the exercise of such power to end? Once grant such a power, and what was to prevent a slave-holding majority in congress from forcing slavery upon some territory where it was not wanted? Mr. Tyler pursued the argument so far as to deny "that congress, under its constitutional authority to establish rules and regulations for the territories, had any control whatever over slavery in the territorial domain." (See life, by Lyon G. Tyler, vol. i., p. 319.) Mr. Tyler was unquestionably foremost among the members of congress in occupying this position. When the Missouri compromise bill was adopted by a vote of 134 to 42, all but five of the nays were from the south, and from Virginia alone there were seventeen, of which Mr. Tyler's vote was one. The Richmond "Enquirer" of March 7, 1820, in denouncing the compromise, observed, in language of prophetic interest, that the southern and western representatives now "owe it to themselves to keep their eyes firmly fixed on Texas; if we are cooped up on the north, we must have elbow-room to the west."

Mr. Tyler's further action in this congress related chiefly to the question of a protective tariff, of which he was an unflinching opponent. In 1821, finding his health seriously impaired, he declined a re-election, and returned to private life. His re-

tirement, however, was of short duration, for in 1823 he was again elected to the Virginia legislature. Here, as a friend to the candidacy of William H. Crawford for the presidency, he disapproved the attacks upon the congressional caucus begun by the legislature of Tennessee in the interests of Andrew Jackson. The next year he was nominated to fill the vacancy in the United States senate created by the death of John Taylor; but Littleton W. Tazewell was elected over him. He opposed the attempt to remove William and Mary college to Richmond, and was afterward made successively rector and chancellor of the college, which prospered signally under his management. In December, 1825, he was chosen by the legislature to the governorship of Virginia, and in the following year he was re-elected by a unanimous vote. A new division of parties was now beginning to show itself in national politics. The administration of John Quincy Adams had pronounced itself in favor of what was then, without much regard to history, described as the "American system" of government banking, high tariffs, and internal improvements. Those persons who were inclined to a loose construction of the constitution were soon drawn to the side of the administration, while the strict constructionists were gradually united in opposition.

Many members of Crawford's party, under

the lead of John Randolph, became thus united with the Jacksonians, while others, of whom Mr. Tyler was one of the most distinguished, maintained a certain independence in opposition. It is to be set down to Mr. Tyler's credit that he never attached any importance to the malicious story, believed by so many Jacksonians, of a corrupt bargain between Adams and Clay. Soon after the meeting of the Virginia legislature, in December, 1826, the friends of Clay and Adams combined with the opposite party who were dissatisfied with Randolph, and thus Mr. Tyler was elected to the U. S. senate by a majority of 115 votes to 110. Some indiscreet friends of Jackson now attempted to show that there must have been some secret and reprehensible understanding between Tyler and Clay; but this scheme failed completely. In the senate Mr. Tyler took a conspicuous stand against the so-called "tariff of abominations" enacted in 1828, which Benton, Van Buren, and other prominent Jacksonians, not yet quite clear as to their proper attitude, were induced to support. There was thus some ground for the opinion entertained at this time by Mr. Tyler, that the Jacksonians were not really strict constructionists. In February, 1830, after taking part in the Virginia convention for revising the state constitution, Mr. Tyler returned to his seat in the senate, and found himself first drawn toward Jackson by the veto

message of the latter, May 27, upon the Maysville turnpike bill. He attacked the irregularity of Jackson's appointment of commissioners to negotiate a commercial treaty with Turkey without duly informing the senate. On the other hand, he voted in favor of confirming the appointment of Van Buren as minister to Great Britain. In the presidential election of 1832 he supported Jackson as a less objectionable candidate than the others, Clay, Wirt and Ford. Mr. Tyler disapproved of nullification, and condemned the course of South Carolina as both unconstitutional and impolitic. At the same time he objected to President Jackson's famous proclamation of December 10, 1832, as a "tremendous engine of federalism," tending to the "consolidation" of the states into a single political body. Under the influence of these feelings he undertook to play the part of mediator between Clay and Calhoun, and in that capacity earnestly supported the compromise tariff introduced by the former in the senate, February 12, 1833. On the so-called "force bill," clothing the president with extraordinary powers for the purpose of enforcing the tariff law, Mr. Tyler showed that he had the courage of his convictions. When the bill was put to vote, February 20, 1833, some of its opponents happened to be absent; others got up and went out in order to avoid putting them-

selves on record. The vote, as then taken, stood: yeas, thirty-two; nay, one (John Tyler).

As President Jackson's first term had witnessed a division in the Democratic party between the nullifiers led by Calhoun and the unconditional upholders of the Union, led by the president himself, with Benton, Blair, and Van Buren, so his second term witnessed a somewhat similar division arising out of the war upon the United States bank. The tendency of this fresh division was to bring Mr. Tyler and his friends nearer to co-operation with Mr. Calhoun, while at the same time it furnished points of contact that might, if occasion should offer, be laid hold of for the purpose of forming a temporary alliance with Mr. Clay and the National Republicans. The origin of the name "Whig," in its strange and anomalous application to the combination in 1834, is to be found in the fact that it pleased the fancy of President Jackson's opponents to represent him as a kind of arbitrary tyrant. On this view it seemed proper that they should be designated "Whigs," and at first there were some attempts to discredit the supporters of the administration by calling them "Tories." On the question of the bank, when it came to the removal of the deposits, Mr. Tyler broke with the administration. Against the bank he had fought, on every fitting occasion, since the beginning of his public career. In 1834 he declared

emphatically: "I believe the bank to be the original sin against the constitution, which, in the progress of our history, has called into existence a numerous progeny of usurpations. Shall I permit this serpent, however bright its scales or erect its mien, to exist by and through my vote?" Nevertheless, strongly as he disapproved of the bank, Mr. Tyler disapproved still more strongly of the methods by which President Jackson assailed it. There seemed at that time to be growing up in the United States a spirit of extreme unbridled democracy quite foreign to the spirit in which our constitutional government, with its carefully arranged checks and limitations, was founded. It was a spirit that prompted mere majorities to insist upon having their way, even at the cost of overriding all constitutional checks and limits. This spirit possessed many members of Jackson's party, and it found expression in what Benton grotesquely called the "*demos krateo*" principle. A good illustration of it was to be seen in Benton's argument, after the election of 1824, that Jackson, having received a plurality of electoral votes, ought to be declared president, and that the house of representatives, in choosing Adams, was "defying the will of the people."

In similar wise President Jackson, after his triumphant re-election in 1832, was inclined to interpret his huge majorities as meaning that the


62 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

people were ready to uphold him in any course that he might see fit to pursue. This feeling no doubt strengthened him in his determined attitude toward the nullifiers, and it certainly contributed to his arbitrary and overbearing method of dealing with the bank, culminating in 1833 in his removal of the deposits. There was ground for maintaining that in this act the president exceeded his powers, and it seemed to illustrate the tendency of unbridled democracy toward despotism, under the leadership of a headstrong and popular chief. Mr. Tyler saw in it such a tendency, and he believed that the only safeguard for constitutional government, whether against the arbitrariness of Jackson or the latitudinarianism of the National Republicans, lay in a most rigid adherence to strict constructionist doctrines. Accordingly, in his speech of February 24, 1834, he proposed to go directly to the root of the matter and submit the question of a national bank to the people in the shape of a constitutional amendment, either expressly forbidding or expressly allowing congress to create such an institution. According to his own account, he found Clay and Webster ready to co-operate with him in this course, while Calhoun held aloof. Nothing came of the project: but it is easy to see in Mr. Tyler's attitude at this time the basis for a short-lived alliance with the National Republicans, whenever circumstances should suggest it. On Mr. Clay's

famous resolution to censure the president he voted in the affirmative. In the course of 1835 the seriousness of the schism in the Democratic party was fully revealed. Not only had the small body of nullifiers broken away, under the lead of Calhoun, but a much larger party was formed in the southern states under the appellation of "state-rights Whigs." They differed with the National Republicans on the fundamental questions of tariff, bank, and internal improvements, and agreed with them only in opposition to Jackson as an alleged violator of the constitution. Even in this opposition they differed from the party of Webster and Clay, for they grounded it largely upon a theory of state rights which the latter statesmen had been far from accepting. The "state-rights Whigs" now nominated Hugh L. White, of Tennessee, for president, and John Tyler for vice-president.

The National Republicans, wishing to gather votes from the other parties, nominated for president Gen. William H. Harrison as a more colorless candidate than Webster or Clay. The Democratic followers of Jackson nominated Van Buren, who received a large majority of both popular and electoral votes, in spite of the defections above mentioned. There was a great deal of bolting in this election. Massachusetts threw its vote for Webster for president, and South Carolina for Willie P. Mangum. Virginia, which voted for Van

Buren, rejected his colleague, Richard M. Johnson, and cast its twenty-three electoral votes for William Smith, of Alabama, for vice-president. Mr. White obtained the electoral votes of Tennessee and Georgia, twenty-six in all, but Mr. Tyler made a better showing; he carried, besides these two states, Maryland and South Carolina, making forty-seven votes in all. The unevenness of the results was such that the election of a vice-president devolved upon the senate, which chose Mr. Johnson. In the course of the year preceding the election an incident occurred which emphasized more than ever Mr. Tyler's hostility to the Jackson party. Benton's famous resolutions for expunging the vote of censure upon the president were before the senate, and the Democratic legislature of Virginia instructed the two senators from that state to vote in the affirmative. As to the binding force of such instructions Mr. Tyler had long ago, in the case of Giles and Brent, above mentioned, placed himself unmistakably upon record. His colleague, Benjamin Watkins Leigh, was known to entertain similar views. On receiving the instructions, both senators refused to obey them. Both voted against the Benton resolutions, but Mr. Leigh kept his seat, while Mr. Tyler resigned and returned home, February 29, 1836. About this time the followers of Calhoun were bringing forward what was known as the "gag resolution" against all petitions



SHERWOOD FOREST, GREENE CO., VA., THE HOME OF JOHN TYLER

and motions relating in any way to the abolition of slavery. Mr. Tyler's resignation occurred before this measure was adopted, but his opinions on the subject were clearly pronounced. He condemned the measure as impolitic, because it yoked together the question as to the right of petition and the question as to slavery, and thus gave a distinct moral advantage to the Abolitionists. On the seventh anniversary of the Virginia colonization society, January 10, 1838, he was chosen its president. In the spring election of that year he was returned to the Virginia legislature. In January, 1839, his friends put him forward for re-election to the U. S. senate, and in the memorable contest that ensued, in which William C. Rives was his principal competitor, the result was a deadlock, and the question was indefinitely postponed before any choice had been made.

Meanwhile the financial crisis of 1837—the most severe, in many respects, that has ever been known in this country—had wrecked the administration of President Van Buren. The causes of that crisis, indeed, lay deeper than any acts of any administration. The primary cause was the sudden development of wild speculation in western lands, consequent upon the rapid building of railroads, which would probably have brought about a general prostration of credit, even if President Jackson had never made war upon the United

66 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

States bank. But there is no doubt that some measures of Jackson's administration—such as the removal of the deposits and their lodgment in the so-called "pet banks," the distribution of the surplus followed by the sudden stoppage of distribution, and the sharpness of the remedy supplied by the specie circular—had much to do with the virulence of the crisis. For the moment it seemed to many people that all the evil resulted from the suppression of the bank, and that the proper cure was the reinstatement of the bank, and because President Van Buren was too wise and clear-sighted to lend his aid to such a policy, his chances for re-election were ruined. The cry for the moment was that the hard-hearted administration was doing nothing to relieve the distress of the people, and there was a general combination against Van Buren. For the single purpose of defeating him, all differences of policy were for the moment subordinated. In the Whig convention at Harrisburg, December 4, 1839, no platform of principles was adopted. Gen. Harrison was again nominated for the presidency, as a candidate fit to conciliate the anti-Masons and National Republicans whom Clay had offended, and Mr. Tyler was nominated for the vice-presidency in order to catch the votes of such Democrats as were dissatisfied with the administration. In the uproarious canvass that followed there was probably less appeal to sober

reason and a more liberal use of clap-trap than in any other presidential contest in our history. Borne upon a great wave of popular excitement, "Tippecanoe, and Tyler too," were carried to the White House. By the death of President Harrison, April 4, 1841, just a month after the inauguration, Mr. Tyler became president of the United States. The situation thus developed was not long in producing startling results. Although no platform had been adopted in the nominating convention, it soon appeared that Mr. Clay and his friends intended to use their victory in support of the old National Republican policy of a national bank, a high tariff, and internal improvements. Unquestionably many people who voted for Harrison did so in the belief that his election meant the victory of Clay's doctrines and the re-establishment of the United States bank. Mr. Clay's own course, immediately after the inauguration, showed so plainly that he regarded the election as his own victory that Gen. Harrison felt called upon to administer a rebuke to him. "You seem to forget, sir," said he, "that it is I who am president."

Tyler, on the other hand, regarded the Whig triumph as signifying the overthrow of what he considered a corrupt and tyrannical faction led by Jackson, Van Buren, and Benton; he professed to regard the old National Republican doctrines as virtually postponed by the alliance between them

and his own followers. In truth, it was as ill-yoked an alliance as ever was made. The elements of a fierce quarrel were scarcely concealed, and the removal of President Harrison was all that was needed to kindle the flames of strife. "Tyler dares not resist," said Clay; "I'll drive him before me." On the other hand, the new president declared: "I pray you to believe that my back is to the wall, and that, while I shall deplore the assaults, I shall, if practicable, beat back the assailants"; and he was as good as his word. Congress met in extra session, May 31, 1841, the senate standing 28 Whigs to 22 Democrats, the house 133 Whigs to 108 Democrats. In his opening message President Tyler briefly recounted the recent history of the United States bank, the sub-treasury system, and other financial schemes, and ended with the precautionary words: "I shall be ready to concur with you in the adoption of such system as you may propose, reserving to myself the ultimate power of rejecting any measure which may, in my view of it, conflict with the constitution or otherwise jeopard the prosperity of the country, a power which I could not part with, even if I would, but which I will not believe any act of yours will call into requisition." Congress disregarded the warning. The ground was cleared for action by a bill for abolishing Van Buren's sub-treasury system, which passed both houses and was signed by the

president. But an amendment offered by Mr. Clay, for the repeal of the law of 1836 regulating the deposits in the state banks, was defeated by the votes of a small party led by William C. Rives. The great question then came up. On constitutional grounds, Mr. Tyler's objection to the United States bank had always been that congress had no power to create such a corporation within the limits of a state without the consent of the state ascertained beforehand. He did not deny, however, the power of congress to establish a district bank for the District of Columbia, and, provided the several states should consent, there seemed to be no reason why this district bank should not set up its branch offices all over the country. Mr. Clay's so-called "fiscal bank" bill of 1841 did not make proper provision for securing the assent of the states, and on that ground Mr. Rives proposed an amendment substituting a clause of a bill suggested by Thomas Ewing, secretary of the treasury, to the effect that such assent should be formally secured. Mr. Rives's amendment was supported not only by several "state-rights Whigs," but also by senators Richard H. Bayard and Rufus Choate, and other friends of Mr. Webster. If adopted, its effect would have been conciliatory, and it might perhaps have averted for a moment the rupture between the ill-yoked allies. The Democrats, well aware of this, voted against the amendment, and it was lost. The

70 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

bill incorporating the fiscal bank of the United States was then passed by both houses, and on August 16 was vetoed. An attempt to pass the bill over the veto failed of the requisite two-thirds majority.

The Whig leaders had already shown a disposition to entrap the president. Before the passage of Mr. Clay's bill, John Minor Botts was sent to the White House with a private suggestion for a compromise. Mr. Tyler refused to listen to the suggestion except with the understanding that, should it meet with his disapproval, he should not hear from it again. The suggestion turned out to be a proposal that congress should authorize the establishment of branches of the district bank in any state of which the legislature at its very next session should not expressly refuse its consent to any such proceeding; and that, moreover, in case the interests of the public should seem to require it, even such expressed refusal might be disregarded and overridden. By this means the obnoxious institution might first be established in the Whig states, and then forced upon the Democratic states in spite of themselves. The president indignantly rejected the suggestion as "a contemptible subterfuge, behind which he would not skulk." The device, nevertheless, became incorporated in Mr. Clay's bill, and it was pretended that it was put there in order to smooth the way for the president to adopt

the measure, but that in his unreasonable obstinacy he refused to avail himself of the opportunity. After his veto of August 16 these tortuous methods were renewed. Messengers went to and fro between the president and members of his cabinet, on the one hand, and leading Whig members of congress on the other, conditional assurances were translated into the indicative mood, whispered messages were magnified and distorted, and presently appeared upon the scene an outline of a bill that it was assumed the president would sign.

This new measure was known as the "fiscal corporation" bill. Like the fiscal bank bill, it created a bank in the District of Columbia, with branches throughout the states, and it made no proper provision for the consent of the states. The president had admitted that a "fiscal agency" of the United States government, established in Washington for the purpose of collecting, keeping, and disbursing the public revenue, was desirable if not indispensable; a regular bank of discount, engaged in commercial transactions throughout the states, and having the United States government as its principal share-holder and Federal officers exerting a controlling influence upon its directorship, was an entirely different affair—something, in his opinion, neither desirable nor permissible. In the "fiscal corporation" bill an attempt was made to hoodwink the president and the public by a pretence

of forbidding discounts and loans and limiting the operations of the fiscal agency exclusively to exchanges. While this project was maturing, the Whig newspapers fulminated with threats against the president in case he should persist in his course; private letters warned him of plots to assassinate him, and Mr. Clay in the senate referred to his resignation in 1836, and asked why, if constitutional scruples again hindered him from obeying the will of the people, did he not now resign his lofty position and leave it for those who could be more compliant? To this it was aptly replied by Mr. Rives that "the president was an independent branch of the government as well as congress, and was not called upon to resign because he differed in opinion with them." Some of the Whigs seem really to have hoped that such a storm could be raised as would browbeat the president into resigning, whereby the government would be temporarily left in the hands of William L. Southard, then president *pro tempore* of the senate. But Mr. Tyler was neither to be hoodwinked nor bullied. The "fiscal corporation" bill was passed by the senate on Saturday, September 4, 1841; on Thursday, the 9th, the president's veto message was received; on Saturday, the 11th, Thomas Ewing, secretary of the treasury, John Bell, secretary of war, George E. Badger, secretary of the navy, John J. Crittenden, attorney-general, and Fran-

cis Granger, postmaster-general, resigned their places.* The adjournment of congress had been fixed for Monday, the 13th, and it was hoped that, suddenly confronted by a unanimous resignation of the cabinet and confused by want of time in which to appoint a new cabinet, the president would

* John Tyler, Jr., the son and private secretary of President Tyler, speaking to a friend of his father's hold-over cabinet, said: "When my father succeeded to the presidency he continued Harrison's cabinet in office until he found that they were working against him. His first cabinet meeting was held on the day succeeding the death of President Harrison and it was perhaps the most remarkable cabinet meeting in history. When all the members were present and the doors were closed Daniel Webster, the secretary of state, arose and addressed my father, saying: 'Mr. President, I suppose you intend to carry out the ideas and customs of your predecessor, and that this administration, inaugurated by President Harrison, will continue in the same line of policy on which it has begun. Am I right?'"

"My father, much astonished, nodded his head almost involuntarily and looked at Mr. Webster with wonder. Daniel Webster straightened himself up at this and continued:

"'Mr. President, it was the custom in our cabinet meetings of President Harrison that he should preside over them. All measures relating to the administration were to be brought before the cabinet and their settlement was to be decided by the majority of votes, each member of the cabinet and the president having but one vote.'

"My father was always courteous, but he was also firm. He rose to his feet, and looking about the cabinet apartment he said: 'Gentlemen, I am very proud to have in my cabinet such able statesmen as you have proved yourselves to be. I shall be pleased to avail myself of your counsel and advice, but I can never consent to being dictated to as to what I shall or shall not do. I am the president, and I shall be held responsible for my administration. I hope I shall have your hearty co-operation in carrying out its measures. So long as you see fit to do this I shall be glad to have you with me. When you think otherwise I will be equally glad to receive your resignation.' This," concluded Mr. Tyler, "settled the question, and there was no further trouble as to who was the head of the cabinet."

A similar incident occurred in Lincoln's cabinet.—EDITOR.

give up the game. But the resignation was not unanimous, for Daniel Webster, secretary of state, remained at his post, and on Monday morning the president nominated Walter Forward, of Pennsylvania, for secretary of the treasury; John McLean, of Ohio, for secretary of war; Abel P. Upshur, of Virginia, for secretary of the navy; Hugh S. Legaré, of South Carolina, for attorney-general; and Charles A. Wickliffe, of Kentucky, for postmaster-general. These appointments were duly confirmed.

Whether the defection of Mr. Webster at this moment would have been so fatal to the president as some of the Whigs were inclined to believe may well be questioned, but there can be no doubt that his adherence to the president was of great value. By remaining in the cabinet Mr. Webster showed himself too clear-sighted to contribute to a victory of which the whole profit would be reaped by his rival, Mr. Clay, and the president was glad to retain his hold upon so strong an element in the north as that which Mr. Webster represented. Some of the leading Whig members of congress now issued addresses to the people, in which they loudly condemned the conduct of the president and declared that "all political connection between them and John Tyler was at an end from that day forth." It was open war between the two departments of government. Although many Whig members, like

Preston, Talmadge, Johnson, and Marshall, really sympathized with Mr. Tyler, only a few, commonly known as "the corporal's guard," openly recognized him as their leader. But the Democratic members came to his support as an ally against the Whigs. The state elections of 1841 showed some symptoms of a reaction in favor of the president's views, for in general the Whigs lost ground in them. As the spectre of the crisis of 1837 faded away in the distance, the people began to recover from the sudden and overmastering impulse that had swept the country in 1840, and the popular enthusiasm for the bank soon died away. Mr. Tyler had really won a victory of the first magnitude, as was conclusively shown in 1844, when the presidential platform of the Whigs was careful to make no allusion whatever to the bank. On this crucial question the doctrines of paternal government had received a crushing and permanent defeat.

In the next session of congress the strife with the president was renewed; but it was now tariff, not bank, that furnished the subject of discussion. Diminished importations, due to the general prostration of business, had now diminished the revenue until it was insufficient to meet the expenses of government. The Whigs accordingly carried through congress a bill continuing the protective duties of 1833, and providing that the surplus reve-

76 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

nue, which was thus sure soon to accumulate, should be distributed among the states. But the compromise act of 1833, in which Mr. Tyler had played an important part, had provided that the protective policy should come to an end in 1842. Both on this ground, and because of the provision for distributing the surplus, the president vetoed the new bill. Congress then devised and passed another bill, providing for a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, but still contemplating a distribution of the surplus, if there should be any. The president vetoed this bill. Congress received the veto message with great indignation, and on the motion of ex-President John Q. Adams it was referred to a committee, which condemned it as an unwarrantable assumption of power and, after a caustic summary of Mr. Tyler's acts since his accession to office, concluded with a reference to impeachment. This report called forth from the president a formal protest; but the victory was already his. The Whigs were afraid to go before the country in the autumn elections with the tariff question unsettled, and the bill was accordingly passed by both houses, without the distributing clause, and was at once signed by the president. The distributing clause was then passed in a separate bill, but a "pocket veto" disposed of it. Congress adjourned on August 31, 1842, and in the elections the Whig majority of twenty-five in

the house of representatives gave place to a Democratic majority of sixty-one.

On the remaining question of National Republican policy, that of internal improvements, the most noteworthy action of President Tyler was early in 1844, when two river-and-harbor bills were passed by congress, the one relating to the eastern, the other to the western states. Mr. Tyler vetoed the former, but signed the latter, on the ground that the Mississippi river as a great common highway for the commerce of the whole country was the legitimate concern of the national government in a sense that was not true of any other American river. An unsuccessful attempt was made to pass the other bill over the veto. The rest of Mr. Tyler's administration was taken up with the Ashburton treaty with Great Britain, the Oregon question, and the annexation of Texas. Texas had won its independence from Mexico in 1836, and its governor, as well as the majority of its inhabitants, were citizens of the United States. From a broad national standpoint it was in every way desirable that Texas, as well as Oregon, should belong to our Federal Union. In the eastern states there was certainly a failure to appreciate the value of Oregon, which was nevertheless claimed as indisputably our property. On the other hand, it was felt, by a certain element in South Carolina, that if the northern states were to have ample room for

expansion beyond the Rocky mountains, the southern states must have Texas added to their number as a counterpoise, or else the existence of slavery would be imperilled, and these fears were strengthened by the growth of anti-slavery sentiment at the north. The Whigs, who by reason of their tariff policy found their chief strength at the north, were disposed to avail themselves of this anti-slavery sentiment, and accordingly declared themselves opposed to the annexation of Texas. In the meantime the political pressure brought to bear upon Mr. Webster in Massachusetts induced resignation of his portfolio, and he was succeeded in the state department by Hugh S. Legaré, May 9, 1843. In a few weeks Legaré was succeeded by Mr. Upshur, after whose death, on February 28, 1844, the place was filled by John C. Calhoun. After a negotiation extending over two years, a treaty was concluded, April 12, 1844, with the government of Texas, providing for annexation. The treaty was rejected by the senate, by a vote of 35 to 16, all the Whigs and seven Democrats voting in the negative. Thus by the summer of 1844 the alliance between the Whig party and Mr. Tyler's wing of the Democrats had passed away. At the same time the division among the Democrats, which had become marked during Jackson's administration, still continued; and while the opposition to Mr. Tyler was strong enough to prevent his nomi-

nation in the Democratic national convention, which met at Baltimore on May 27, 1844, on the other hand he was able to prevent the nomination of Mr. Van Buren, who had declared himself opposed to the immediate annexation of Texas. The result was the nomination of James K. Polk, as a kind of compromise candidate, in so far as he belonged to the "loco-foco" wing of the party, but was at the same time in favor of annexation.

On the same day, May 27, another convention at Baltimore nominated Mr. Tyler for a second term. He accepted the nomination in order to coerce the Democrats into submitting to him and his friends a formal invitation to re-enter the ranks; and accordingly a meeting of Democrats at the Carleton house, New York, on August 6, adopted a series of resolutions commending the principal acts of his administration, and entreating that in the general interests of the opposition he should withdraw. In response to this appeal, Mr. Tyler accordingly withdrew his name. The northern opposition to the annexation of Texas seemed to have weakened the strength of the Whigs in the south, and their candidate, Henry Clay, declared himself willing to see Texas admitted at some future time. But this device cut both ways; for while it was popular in the south, and is supposed to have acquired for Clay many pro-slavery votes, carrying for him Tennessee, North Carolina, Delaware, and Mary-

land by bare majorities, it certainly led many anti-slavery Whigs to throw away their votes upon the "Liberty" candidate, James G. Birney, and thus surrender New York to the Democrats. The victory of the Democrats in November was reflected in the course pursued in the ensuing congress. One of the party watchwords, in reference to the Oregon question, had been "fifty-four forty, or fight," and the house of representatives now proceeded to pass a bill organizing a territorial government for Oregon up to that parallel of latitude. The senate, however, laid the bill upon the table, because it prohibited slavery in the territory. A joint resolution for the annexation of Texas was passed by both houses. Proposals for prohibiting slavery there were defeated, and the affair was arranged by extending the Missouri compromise-line westward through the Texan territory to be acquired by the annexation. North of that line slavery was to be prohibited; south of it the question was to be determined by the people living on the spot. The resolutions were signed by President Tyler, and instructions in accordance therewith were despatched by him to Texas on the last day of his term of office, March 3, 1845. The friends of annexation defended the constitutionality of this proceeding, and the opponents denounced it.

After leaving the White House, Mr. Tyler took

I am busily engaged in reeding & laying
out of wheat. Shall I be permitted to reap it
at its maturity in peace. Time will decide.

We are all well. Gandhi and Maria write
to India, when return home with the book
for with much solicitude during the past
week. He intends to present my kindest
greetings to your wife and all. and he
expressed of my constant good wishes and
affectionate esteem -

Truly yrs

John Tyler

Col. Gardener

up his residence on an estate that he had purchased three miles from Greenway, on the bank of James river. To this estate he gave the name of "Sherwood Forest," and there he lived the rest of his life. In a letter published in the Richmond "Enquirer" on January 17, 1861, he recommended a convention of border states—including New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, as well as Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri—for the purpose of devising some method of adjusting the difficulties brought on by the secession of South Carolina. The scheme adopted by this convention was to be submitted to the other states, and, if adopted, was to be incorporated into the Federal constitution. In acting upon Mr. Tyler's suggestion, the Virginia legislature enlarged it into a proposal of a peace convention to be composed of delegates from all the states. At the same time Mr. Tyler was appointed a commissioner to President Buchanan, while Judge John Robertson was appointed commissioner to the state of South Carolina, the object being to persuade both parties to abstain from any acts of hostility until the proposed peace convention should have had an opportunity to meet and discuss the situation. In discharge of this mission Mr. Tyler arrived on January 23 in Washington. President Buchanan declined to give any assurance, but in his message

82 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

to congress, on January 28, he deprecated a hasty resort to hostile measures.

The peace convention, consisting of delegates from thirteen northern and seven border states, met at Washington on February 4 and chose Mr. Tyler as its president. Several resolutions were adopted and reported to congress, February 27; but on March 2 they were rejected in the senate by a vote of 28 to 7, and two days later the house adjourned without having taken a vote upon them. On February 28, anticipating the fate of the resolutions in congress, Mr. Tyler made a speech on the steps of the Exchange hotel in Richmond, and declared his belief that no arrangement could be made, and that nothing was left for Virginia but to act promptly in the exercise of her powers as a sovereign state. The next day he took his seat in the State convention, where he advocated the immediate passing of an ordinance of secession. His attitude seems to have been substantially the same that it had been twenty-eight years before, when he disapproved the heresy of nullification, but condemned with still greater emphasis the measures taken by President Jackson to suppress that heresy. This feeling that secession was unadvisable, but coercion wholly indefensible, was shared by Mr. Tyler with many people in the border states. On the removal of the government of the southern Confederacy from Montgomery to Richmond, in

May, 1861, he was unanimously elected a member of the provisional congress of the Confederate states. In the following autumn he was elected to the permanent congress, but he died before taking his seat. He was buried in Hollywood Cemetery, Richmond, where as yet his grave, near that of James Monroe, is, strange to say, unmarked.* His biography has been ably written by Lyon Gardiner Tyler, "The Letters and Times of the Tylers" (3 vols., Richmond, 1884-'96). See also "Seven Decades of the Union," by Henry A. Wise (Philadelphia, 1872).

His wife, LETITIA CHRISTIAN, born at Cedar Grove, New Kent County, Va., November 12, 1790; died in Washington, D. C., September 9, 1842, was the daughter of Robert Christian, a planter in New Kent County, Va. She married Mr. Tyler on March 29, 1813, and removed with

* Mr. Tyler was interred with great honors in what is known as the Presidents' Section, being about ten yards to the east of the grave of Monroe. When the writer visited the cemetery, in 1893, no stone marked his own or Mrs. Julia Tyler's grave. Before the war Virginia passed resolutions authorizing the governor to erect an appropriate monument from the funds of the state, but owing to the condition of her finances this has not yet been done. By his will Mr. Tyler's remains were to be buried at his home, Sherwood Forest, in Charles City County, and but for Virginia's interposition his family would long since have erected a suitable monument to his memory. The last session of Congress appropriated the sum of \$10,000 to immediately erect a national monument over the grave of President Tyler.—EDITOR.

him to his home in Charles City County. When he became president she accompanied him to Washington; but her health was delicate, and she died shortly afterward. Mrs. Tyler was unable to assume any social cares, and the duties of mistress of the White House devolved upon her daughter-in-law, Mrs. Robert Tyler. She possessed great beauty of person and of character, and, before the failure of her health, was especially fitted for a social life.

Their son, ROBERT, born in New Kent County, Va., in 1818; died in Montgomery, Ala., December 3, 1877, was educated at William and Mary, and adopted the profession of law. He married Priscilla, a daughter of Thomas Apthorpe Cooper, the tragedian, in 1839, and when his father became president his wife assumed the duties of mistress of the White House till after Mrs. John Tyler's death, when they devolved upon her daughter, Mrs. Letitia Semple. Mr. Tyler removed to Philadelphia in 1843, practised law there, and held several civil offices. In 1844 he was elected president of the Irish repeal association. A little later he became prothonotary of the supreme court of Pennsylvania, and in 1858 he was chairman of the Democratic executive committee of the state. He removed to Richmond at the beginning of the civil war, and was appointed register of the treasury.

After the war he edited the "Mail and Advertiser" in Montgomery, Ala. He published "Ahasuerus," a poem (New York, 1842); "Death, or Medora's Dream," a poem (1843); "Is Virginia a Repudiating State? and the States' Guarantee," two letters (Richmond, Va., 1858).

President Tyler's second wife, JULIA GARDINER, born on Gardiner's island, near Easthampton, N. Y., May 4, 1820; died in Richmond, Va., July 10, 1889, was a descendant of the Gardiners of Gardiner's island. She was educated at the Chegary institute, New York city, spent several months in Europe, and in the winter of 1844 accompanied her father to Washington, D. C. A few weeks afterward he was killed by the explosion of a gun on the war-steamer "Princeton," which occurred during a pleasure excursion in which he and his daughter were of the presidential party. His body was taken to the White House, and Miss Gardiner, being thrown in the society of the president under these peculiar circumstances, became the object of his marked attention, which resulted in their marriage in New York city, June 26, 1844. For the succeeding eight months she presided over the White House with dignity and grace, her residence there terminating with a birth-night ball on February 22, 1845. Mrs. Tyler retired with her husband to "Sherwood Forest" in Virginia at the

conclusion of his term, and after the civil war resided for several years at her mother's residence on Castleton Hill, Staten island, and subsequently in Richmond, Va. She was a convert to Roman Catholicism, was devoted to the charities of that church, and is buried by the side of her husband in Hollywood Cemetery.

Her son, LYON GARDINER, born in Charles City County, Va., August 12, 1853, was graduated at the University of Virginia in 1875, and then studied law. During his college course he was elected orator of the Jefferson society, and obtained a scholarship as best editor of the "Virginia University Magazine." In January, 1877, he was elected professor of belles-lettres in William and Mary college, which place he held until November, 1878, when he became head of a high-school in Memphis, Tenn. He settled in Richmond, Va., in 1882, and entered on the practice of law, also taking an active interest in politics. He was a candidate for the house of delegates in 1885, and again in 1887, when he was elected. In that body he advocated the bills to establish a labor bureau, to regulate child labor, and to aid William and Mary college. In 1888 he was elected president of the college, which office he now fills. He has published "The Letters and Times of the Tylers"

(3 vols., Richmond, 1884-'96); "Parties and Patronage in the United States" (New York, 1891); and he is the editor of the "William and Mary College Quarterly," established in 1892.

JAMES KNOX POLK

BY


GEORGE BANCROFT

JAMES KNOX POLK

JAMES KNOX POLK, eleventh president of the United States, born in Mecklenburg County, N. C., November 2, 1795; died in Nashville, Tenn., June 15, 1849. He was a son of Samuel Polk, whose father, Ezekiel, was a brother of Col. Thomas, grandson of Robert Polk or Pollock, who was born in Ireland and emigrated to the United States. His mother was Jane, daughter of James Knox, a resident of Iredell County, N. C., and a captain in the war of the Revolution. His father, Samuel, a farmer, removed in the autumn of 1806 to the rich valley of Duck river, a tributary of the Tennessee, and made a new home in a section that was erected the following year into the county of Maury. Besides cultivating the tract of land he had purchased, Samuel at intervals followed the occupation of a surveyor, acquired a fortune equal to his wants, and lived until 1827. His son James was brought up on the farm, and not only assisted in its management, but frequently accompanied his father in his surveying expeditions, during which they were often absent for weeks. He was inclined to study, often busied himself with his

92 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

father's mathematical calculations, and was fond of reading. He was sent to school, and had succeeded in mastering the English branches when ill health compelled his removal. He was then placed with a merchant, but, having a strong dislike to commercial pursuits, he obtained permission to return home after a few weeks' trial, and in July, 1813, was given in charge of a private tutor. In 1815 he entered the sophomore class at the University of North Carolina, of which institution his cousin, William, was a trustee. As a student young Polk was correct, punctual, and industrious. At his graduation in 1818 he was officially acknowledged to be the best scholar in both the classics and mathematics, and delivered the Latin salutatory. In 1847 the university conferred upon him the degree of LL.D. In 1819 he entered the law-office of Felix Grundy, who was then at the head of the Tennessee bar. While pursuing his legal studies he attracted the attention of Andrew Jackson, who soon afterward was appointed governor of the territory of Florida. An intimacy was thus begun between the two men that in after years greatly influenced the course of at least one of them. In 1820 Mr. Polk was admitted to the bar, and established himself at Columbia, the county-seat of Maury County. Here he attained such immediate success as falls to the lot of few, his career at the bar only ending with his election to the governor-



James A. Folk

From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C.

ship in 1839. At times he practised alone, while at others he was associated successively with several of the leading practitioners of the state. Among the latter may be mentioned Aaron V. Brown and Gideon J. Pillow.

Brought up as a Jeffersonian, and early taking an interest in politics, Mr. Polk was frequently heard in public as an exponent of the views of his party. So popular was his style of oratory that his services soon came to be in great demand, and he was not long in earning the title of the "Napoleon of the Stump." He was, however, an argumentative rather than a rhetorical speaker, and convinced his hearers by plainness of statement and aptness of illustration, ignoring the *ad-captandum* effects usually resorted to in political harangues. His first public employment was that of chief clerk to the Tennessee house of representatives, and in 1823 he canvassed the district to secure his own election to that body. During his two years in the legislature he was regarded as one of its most promising members. His ability and shrewdness in debate, his business tact, combined with his firmness and industry, secured for him a high reputation. While a member of the general assembly he obtained the passage of a law to prevent the then common practice of duelling, and, although he resided in a community where that mode of settling disputes was generally approved, he was never

concerned in an "affair of honor," either as principal or as second. In August, 1825, he was elected to congress from the Duck river district, in which he resided, by a flattering majority, and re-elected at every succeeding election until 1839, when he withdrew from the contest to become a candidate for governor.

On taking his seat as a member of the 19th congress, he found himself, with one or two exceptions, the youngest member of that body. The same habits of laborious application that had previously characterized him were now displayed on the floor of the house and in the committee-room. He was prominently connected with every leading question, and upon all he struck what proved to be the key-note for the action of his party. During the whole period of President Jackson's administration he was one of its leading supporters, and at times, on certain issues of paramount importance, its chief reliance. His maiden speech was made in defence of the proposed amendment to the constitution, giving the choice of president and vice-president directly to the people. It was distinguished by clearness and force, copiousness of research, wealth of illustration, and cogency of argument, and at once placed its author in the front rank of congressional debaters. During the same session Mr. Polk attracted attention by his vigorous opposition to the appropriation for the

Panama mission. President Adams had appointed commissioners to attend a congress proposed to be held at Panama by delegates appointed by different Spanish-American states, which, although they had virtually achieved their independence, were still at war with the mother-country. Mr. Polk, and those who thought with him, contended that such action on the part of this government would tend to involve us in a war with Spain, and establish an unfortunate precedent for the future.

In December, 1827, he was placed on the committee on foreign affairs, and some time afterward was also appointed chairman of the select committee to which was referred that portion of the message of President Adams calling the attention of congress to the probable accumulation of a surplus in the treasury after the anticipated extinguishment of the national debt. At the head of the latter committee, he made a report denying the constitutional power of congress to collect from the people for distribution a surplus beyond the wants of the government, and maintaining that the revenue should be reduced to the requirements of the public service. Early in 1833, as a member of the ways and means committee, he made a minority report unfavorable to the Bank of the United States, which aroused a storm of opposition, a meeting of the friends of the bank being held at Nashville. During the entire contest be-

tween the bank and President Jackson, caused by the removal of the deposits in October, 1833, Mr. Polk, now chairman of the committee, supported the executive. His speech in opening the debate summarized the material facts and arguments on the Democratic side of the question. George McDuffie, leader of the opposition, bore testimony in his concluding remarks to the boldness and manliness with which Mr. Polk had assumed the only position that could be judiciously taken. Mr. Polk was elected speaker of the house of representatives in December, 1835, and held that office till 1839. He gave to the administration of Martin Van Buren the same unhesitating support he had accorded to that of President Jackson, and, though taking no part in the discussions, he approved of the leading measures recommended by the former, including the cession of the public lands to the states, the pre-emption law, and the proposal to establish an independent treasury, and exerted his influence to secure their adoption. He was the speaker during five sessions, and it was his fortune to preside over the house at a period when party feelings were excited to an unusual degree. Notwithstanding the fact that during the first session more appeals were taken from his decisions than were ever known before, he was uniformly sustained by the house, and frequently by leading members of the Whig party. Although he was

opposed to the doctrines of the anti-slavery reformers, we have the testimony of their leader in the house, John Quincy Adams, to the effect that Speaker Polk uniformly extended to him "every kindness and courtesy imaginable."

On leaving congress, Mr. Polk became the candidate of the Democrats of Tennessee for governor. They had become disheartened by a series of disasters and defeats caused primarily by the defection of John Bell and Judge Hugh L. White. Under these circumstances it was evident that no one but the strongest man in the party could enter the canvass with the slightest prospect of success, and it was doubtful whether even he could carry off the prize. On being asked, Mr. Polk at once cheerfully consented to allow his name to be used. He was nominated in the autumn of 1838, but, owing to his congressional duties, was unable fairly to enter upon the canvass until the spring of 1839. His opponent was Newton Cannon, also a Democrat, who then held the office. The contest was spirited, and Mr. Polk was elected by over 2,500 majority. On October 14 he took the oath of office. In his inaugural address he touched upon the relations of the state and Federal governments, declared that the latter had no constitutional power to incorporate a national bank, took strong ground against the creation of a surplus Federal revenue by taxation, asserted that "the agitation of the

Abolitionists can by no possibility produce good to any portion of the Union, but must, if persisted in, lead to incalculable mischief," and discussed at length other topics, especially bearing upon the internal policy of Tennessee. In 1841 Mr. Polk was again a candidate for the governorship, although his defeat was a foregone conclusion in view of the political whirlwind that had swept over the country in 1840 and resulted in the election of William Henry Harrison to the presidency. In Tennessee the Harrison electoral ticket had received more than 12,000 majority. Although to overcome this was impossible, Mr. Polk entered upon the canvass with his usual energy and earnestness. He could not secure the defeat of James C. Jones, the opposing Whig candidate, one of the most popular members of his party in the state, but he did succeed in cutting down the opposition majority to about 3,000. In 1843 Mr. Polk was once more a candidate; but this time Gov. Jones's majority was nearly 4,000.

In 1839 Mr. Polk had been nominated by the legislature of Tennessee as its candidate for vice-president on the ticket with Martin Van Buren, and other states had followed the example; but Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, seemed to be the choice of the great body of the Democratic party, and he was accordingly nominated. From the date of Van Buren's defeat in 1840 until

within a few weeks of the meeting of the National Democratic convention at Baltimore in 1844, public opinion in the party undoubtedly pointed to his renomination, but when in April of the latter year President Tyler concluded a treaty between the government of the United States and the republic of Texas, providing for the annexation of the latter to the Union, a new issue was introduced into American politics that was destined to change not only the platforms of parties, but the future history and topography of the country itself. On the question whether Texas should be admitted, the greatest divergence of opinion among public men prevailed. The Whig party at the north opposed annexation, on the grounds that it would be an act of bad faith to Mexico, that it would involve the necessity of assuming the debt of the young republic, amounting to ten or twelve millions of dollars, and that it would further increase the area of slave territory. At the south the Whigs were divided, one section advocating the new policy, while the other concurred with their party friends at the north on the first two grounds of objection. The Democrats generally favored annexation, but a portion of the party at the north, and a few of its members residing in the slave-states, opposed it. Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Clay agreed very nearly in their opinions, being in favor of annexation if the American people desired it, provided that the

100 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

consent of Mexico could be obtained, or at least that efforts should be made to obtain it.

In this crisis Mr. Polk declared his views in no uncertain tones. It being understood that he would be a candidate for vice-president, a letter was addressed to him by a committee of the citizens of Cincinnati, asking for an expression of his sentiments on the subject. In his reply, dated April 22, 1844, he said: "I have no hesitation in declaring that I am in favor of the immediate reannexation of Texas to the government and territory of the United States. The proof is fair and satisfactory to my own mind that Texas once constituted a part of the territory of the United States, the title to which I regard to have been as indisputable as that to any portion of our territory." He also added that "the country west of the Sabine, and now called Texas, was [in 1819] most unwisely ceded away"; that the people and government of the republic were most anxious for annexation, and that, if their prayer was rejected, there was danger that she might become "a dependency if not a colony of Great Britain." This letter, strongly in contrast with the hesitating phrases contained in that of ex-President Van Buren of April 20 on the same subject, elevated its author to the presidency. When the Baltimore convention met on May 27, it was found that, while Mr. Van Buren could not secure the necessary two-thirds vote, his friends

numbered more than one third of the delegates present, and were thus in a position to dictate the name of the successful candidate. As it was also found that they were inflexibly opposed to Messrs. Cass, Johnson, Buchanan, and the others whose names had been presented, Mr. Polk was introduced as the candidate of conciliation, and nominated with alacrity and unanimity. George M. Dallas was nominated for vice-président. In his letter of acceptance, Mr. Polk declared that, if elected, he should enter upon "the discharge of the high and solemn duties of the office with the settled purpose of not being a candidate for re-election." After an exciting canvass, Mr. Polk was elected over his distinguished opponent, Henry Clay, by about 40,000 majority, on the popular vote, exclusive of that of South Carolina, whose electors were chosen by the legislature of the state; while in the electoral college he received 175 votes to 105 that were cast for Mr. Clay.

On March 4, 1845, Mr. Polk was inaugurated. In his inaugural address, after recounting the blessings conferred upon the nation by the Federal Union, he said: "To perpetuate them, it is our sacred duty to preserve it. Who shall assign limits to the achievements of free minds and free hands under the protection of this glorious Union? No treason to mankind, since the organization of society, would be equal in atrocity to that of him who would

lift his hand to destroy it. He would overthrow the noblest structure of human wisdom which protects himself and his fellow-man. He would stop the progress of free government and involve his country either in anarchy or in despotism." In selecting his cabinet, the new president was singularly fortunate. It comprised several of the most distinguished members of the Democratic party, and all sections of the Union were represented. James Buchanan, fresh from his long experience in the senate, was named secretary of state; Robert J. Walker, also an ex-senator and one of the best authorities on the national finances, was secretary of the treasury; to William L. Marcy, ex-governor of New York, was confided the war portfolio; literature was honored in the appointment of George Bancroft as secretary of the navy; Cave Johnson, a prominent son of Tennessee, was made postmaster-general; and John Y. Mason, who had been a member of President Tyler's cabinet, was first attorney-general and afterward secretary of the navy. When congress met in the following December there was a Democratic majority in both branches. In his message the president condemned all anti-slavery agitation, recommended a sub-treasury and a tariff for revenue, and declared that the annexation of Texas was a matter that concerned only the latter and the United States, no foreign country having any right to interfere.

enclosed from the Sheriff of Mecklenburg, &
to take the original as an official paper.

For some time I have been writing about the letter
I shall send all my letters to Mr. H. under
cover to you. You will of course open &
read them, and thus send for him & deliver
them to him. —

I go tomorrow to Pittsfield where I will
be on Monday. — I will write you again
from Pepper on Wednesday next. —
Your affectionate wife & daughter

Samuel H. Lane

Congress was also informed that the American army under Gen. Zachary Taylor had been ordered to occupy, and had occupied, the western bank of Nueces river, beyond which Texas had never hitherto exercised jurisdiction. On December 29 Texas was admitted into the Union, and two days later an act was passed extending the United States revenue system over the doubtful territory beyond the Nueces. Even these measures did not elicit a declaration of war from the Mexican authorities, who still declared their willingness to negotiate concerning the disputed territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande. These negotiations, however, came to nothing, and the president, in accordance with Gen. Taylor's suggestion, ordered a forward movement, in obedience to which that officer advanced from his camp at Corpus Christi toward the Rio Grande, and occupied the district in debate. Thus brought face to face with Mexican troops, he was attacked early in May with 6,000 men by Gen. Arista, who was badly beaten at Palo Alto, with less than half that number. The next day Taylor attacked Arista at Resaca de la Palma, and drove him across the Rio Grande.

On receipt of the news of these events in Washington, President Polk sent a message to congress, in which he declared that Mexican troops had at last shed the blood of American citizens on American soil, and asked for a formal declaration of war.

104 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

A bill was accordingly introduced and passed by both houses, recognizing the fact that hostilities had been begun, and appropriating \$10,000,000 for its prosecution. Its preamble read as follows: "Whereas, by the act of the republic of Mexico, a state of war exists between that government and the United States." The Whigs protested against this statement as untrue, alleging that the president had provoked retaliatory action by ordering the army into Mexican territory, and Abraham Lincoln introduced in the house of representatives what became known as the "spot resolutions," calling upon the president to designate the spot of American territory whereon the outrage had been committed. Nevertheless, the Whigs voted for the bill and generally supported the war until its conclusion. On August 8 a second message was received from the president, asking for money with which to purchase territory from Mexico, that the dispute might be settled by negotiation. A bill appropriating \$2,000,000 for this purpose at once brought up the question of slavery extension into the new territory, and David Wilmot, of Pennsylvania, in behalf of many northern Democrats, offered an amendment applying to any newly acquired territory the provision of the ordinance of 1781, to the effect that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall ever exist in any part of said territory except for crime, whereof the party

shall first be duly convicted." The Whigs and northern Democrats united secured its passage, but it was sent to the senate too late to be acted upon.

During the same session war with England regarding the Oregon question seemed imminent. By the treaties of 1803 with France, and of 1819 with Spain, the United States had acquired the rights of those powers on the Pacific coast north of California. The northern boundary of the ceded territory was unsettled. The United States claimed that the line of $54^{\circ} 40'$ north latitude was such boundary, while Great Britain maintained that it followed the Columbia river. By the convention of 1827 the disputed territory had been held jointly by both countries, the arrangement being terminable by either country on twelve months' notice. The Democratic convention of 1844 had demanded the reoccupation of the whole of Oregon up to $54^{\circ} 40'$, "with or without war with England," a demand popularly summarized in the campaign rallying-cry of "Fifty-four-forty or fight!" The annexation of Texas having been accomplished, the Whigs now began to urge the Democrats to carry out their promise regarding Oregon, and, against the votes of the extreme southern Democrats, the president was directed to give the requisite twelve months' notice. Further negotiations ensued, which resulted in the offer by Great Britain to yield her claim to the unoccupied territory between the 49th

parallel and Columbia river, and acknowledged that parallel as the northern boundary. As the president had subscribed to the platform of the Baltimore convention, he threw upon the senate the responsibility of deciding whether the claim of the United States to the whole of Oregon should be insisted upon, or the compromise proposed by her majesty's government accepted. The senate, by a vote of 41 to 14, decided in favor of the latter alternative, and on June 15, 1846, the treaty was signed.

Two other important questions were acted upon at the first session of the 39th congress, the tariff and internal improvements. The former had been a leading issue in the presidential contest of 1844. The act of 1842 had violated the principles of the compromise bill of 1833, and the opinions of the two candidates for the presidency, on this issue, were supposed to be well defined previous to the termination of their congressional career. Mr. Polk was committed to the policy of a tariff for revenue, and Mr. Clay, when the compromise act was under discussion, had pledged the party favorable to protection to a reduction of the imposts to a revenue standard. Previous to his nomination, Mr. Clay made a speech at Raleigh, N. C., in which he advocated discriminating duties for the protection of domestic industry. This was followed by his letter in September, 1844, in which he gave in his



POLK PLACE, NASHVILLE, TENN., THE HOME AND TOMB OF JAMES K. POLK

adhesion to the tariff of 1842. Probably alarmed at the prospect of losing votes at the south through his opposition to the annexation of Texas, and seeing defeat certain unless he could rally to his support the people of the north, Mr. Clay made one concession after another, until he had virtually abandoned the ground he occupied in 1833, and made himself amenable to his own rebuke uttered at that time: "What man," he had then asked, "who is entitled to deserve the character of an American statesman, would stand up in his place in either house of congress and disturb the treaty of peace and amity?"

Mr. Polk, on the other hand, had courted criticism by his Kane letter, dated June 19, 1844, which was so ambiguously worded as to give ground for the charge that his position was identical with that held by Henry Clay. In his first annual message, however, he explained his views with precision and ability. The principles that would govern his administration were proclaimed with great boldness, and the objectionable features of the tariff of 1842 were investigated and exposed, while congress was urged to substitute *ad valorem* for specific and minimum duties. "The terms 'protection to American industry,' " he went on to say, "are of popular import, but they should apply under a just system to all the various branches of industry in our country. The farmer, or planter, who toils yearly in

his fields, is engaged in 'domestic industry,' and is as much entitled to have his labor 'protected' as the manufacturer, the man of commerce, the navigator, or the mechanic, who are engaged also in 'domestic industry' in their different pursuits. The joint labors of all these classes constitute the aggregate of the 'domestic industry' of the nation, and they are equally entitled to the nation's 'protection.' No one of them can justly claim to be the exclusive recipients of 'protection,' which can only be afforded by increasing burdens on the 'domestic industry' of others." In accordance with the president's views, a bill providing for a purely revenue tariff, and based on a plan prepared by Sec. Walker, was introduced in the house of representatives on June 15. After an unusually able discussion, a vote was reached on July 3, when the measure was adopted by 114 ayes to 95 nays. But it was nearly defeated in the senate, where the vote was tied, and only the decision of Vice-President Dallas in its favor saved the bill. The occasion was memorable, party spirit ran high, and a crowded senate-chamber hung on the lips of that official as he announced the reasons for his course. In conclusion he said: "If by thus acting it be my misfortune to offend any portion of those who honored me with their suffrages, I have only to say to them, and to my whole country, that I prefer the deepest obscurity of private life, with an unwounded con-

science, to the glare of official eminence spotted by a sense of moral delinquency!"

Regarding the question of internal improvements, Mr. Polk's administration was signalized by the struggle between the advocates of that policy and the executive. A large majority in both houses of congress, including members of both parties, were in favor of a lavish expenditure of the public money. On July 24, 1846, the senate passed the bill known as the river-and-harbor improvement bill precisely as it had passed the house the previous March, but it was vetoed by the president in a message of unusual power. The authority of the general government to make internal improvements within the states was thoroughly examined, and reference was made to the corruptions of the system that expended money in particular sections, leaving other parts of the country without government assistance. Undaunted by the opposition of the executive, the house of representatives, on February 20, 1847, passed, by a vote of 89 to 72, a second bill making appropriations amounting to \$600,000 for the same purpose. It was carried through the senate on the last day of the second session. Although the president could have defeated the objectionable measure by a "pocket veto," in spite of the denunciations with which he was assailed by the politicians and the press, he again boldly met the question, and sent

110 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

in a message that, for thoroughness of investigation, breadth of thought, clearness and cogency of argument, far excels any of the state papers to which he has put his name.

The conflict between the friends and opponents of slavery was also a prominent feature of President Polk's administration, and was being constantly waged on the floor of congress. During the second session of the 39th congress the house attached the Wilmot proviso to a bill appropriating \$3,000,000 for the purchase of territory from Mexico, as it had been appended to one appropriating \$2,000,000 for the same purpose at the previous session. The senate passed the bill without the amendment, and the house was compelled to concur. A bill to organize the territory of Oregon, with the proviso attached, passed by the latter body, was not acted upon by the senate. A motion made in the house of representatives by a southern member to extend the Missouri compromise line of 36° 30' to the Pacific was lost by a sectional vote, north against south, 81 to 104. A treaty of peace having been signed with Mexico, February 2, 1848, after a series of victories, a bill was passed by the senate during the first session of the 30th congress, establishing territorial governments in Oregon, New Mexico, and California, with a provision that all questions concerning slavery in those territories should be referred to the U. S. supreme court for

decision. It received the votes of the members from the slave-states, but was lost in the house. A bill was finally passed organizing the territory of Oregon without slavery. During the second session a bill to organize the territories of New Mexico and California with the Wilmot proviso was passed by the house, but the senate refused to consider it. Late in the session the latter body attached a bill permitting such organization with slavery to the general appropriation bill as a "rider," but, as the house objected, was compelled to strike it off. In his message to congress approving the Oregon territorial bill Mr. Polk said: "I have an abiding confidence that the sober reflection and sound patriotism of all the states will bring them to the conclusion that the dictate of wisdom is to follow the example of those who have gone before us, and settle this dangerous question on the Missouri compromise or some other equitable compromise which would respect the rights of all, and prove satisfactory to the different portions of the Union." President Polk was not a slavery propagandist, and consequently had no pro-slavery policy. On the contrary, in the settlement of the Oregon question, he did all in his power to secure the exclusion of slavery from that territory, and, although the final vote was not taken until within a few days after his retirement, the battle was fought and the de-

cision virtually reached during his able administration.

Mr. Polk, in a letter dated May 19, 1848, reiterated his decision not to become a candidate again for the presidency, and retired at the close of his term of office to his home in Nashville with the intention not to re-enter public life. His health, never robust, had been seriously impaired by the unavoidable cares of office and his habit of devoting too much time and strength to the execution of details. Within a few weeks after his permanent return to Tennessee he fell a prey to a disease that would probably have only slightly affected a man in ordinary health, and a few hours sufficed to bring the attack to a fatal termination. Thus ended the life of one of whose public career it may still be too soon to judge with entire impartiality. Some of the questions on which he was called upon to act have remained for half a century after his death party issues. Polk evidently believed with Mr. Clay that a Union all slave or all free was an impossible Utopia, and that there was no good reason why the north and the south should not continue to live for many years to come as they had lived since the adoption of the constitution. He deprecated agitation of the slavery question by the Abolitionists, and believed that the safety of the commonwealth lay in respecting the compromises that had hitherto furnished a *modus vivendi* be-

tween the slave and the free states. As to the annexation of Texas and the war with Mexico, his policy was undoubtedly the result of conviction, sincerity, and good faith. He believed, with John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson, that Texas had been unwisely ceded to Spain in 1819, and that it was desirable, from a geographical point of view, that it should be re-annexed, seeing that it formed a most valuable part of the valley of the Mississippi. He was also of opinion that in a military point of view its acquisition was desirable for the protection of New Orleans, the great commercial mart of the southwestern section of the Union, which in time of war would be endangered by the close proximity of a hostile power having control of the upper waters of Red river. Holding these views and having been elevated to the presidency on a platform that expressly demanded that they should be embodied in action, and Texas again made a part of the national domain, he would have indeed been recreant to his trust had he attempted to carry out as president any policy antagonistic to that he had advocated when a candidate for that office. The war in which he became involved in carrying out these views was a detail that the nation was compelled to leave largely to his judgment. The president believed that the representations and promises of the Mexican authorities could not be trusted, and that the only argument to which

they would pay attention was that of force. Regarding his famous order to Gen. Taylor to march toward the Rio Grande, it was suggested by that officer himself, and for his gallant action in the war the latter was elected the successor of President Polk. The settlement of the Oregon boundary-line was made equally obligatory upon the new president on taking office. He offered Great Britain the line that was finally accepted; but when the British minister hastily rejected the offer, the entire country applauded his suggestion to that power of what the boundary might possibly be in case of war.

But whatever the motives of the executive as to Texas and Oregon, the results of the administration of James K. Polk were brilliant in the extreme. He was loyally upheld by the votes of all parties in congress, abundantly supplied with the sinews of war, and seconded by gallant and competent officers in the field. For \$15,000,000 in addition to the direct war tax expenses, the southwestern boundary of the country was carried to the Rio Grande, while the provinces of New Mexico and Upper California were added to the national domain. What that cession meant in increased wealth it is perhaps even yet too soon to compute. Among the less dazzling but still solid advantages conferred upon the nation during Mr. Polk's term of office was the adoption by congress, on his

recommendation, of the public warehousing system that has since proved so valuable an aid to the commerce of the country; the negotiation of the 35th article of the treaty with Grenada, ratified June 10, 1848, which secured for our citizens the right of way across the Isthmus of Panama; the postal treaty of December 15, 1848, with Great Britain, and the negotiations of commercial treaties with the secondary states of the Germanic confederation by which reciprocal relations were established and growing markets reached upon favorable terms.

Mr. George Bancroft, the last surviving member of Polk's cabinet, who carefully revised and enlarged this biography, in a communication to the editor, dated Washington, March 8, 1888, says: "One of the special qualities of Mr. Polk's mind was his clear perception of the character and doctrines of the two great parties that then divided the country. Of all our public men—I say, distinctly, of all—Polk was the most thoroughly consistent representative of his party. He had no equal. Time and again his enemies sought for grounds on which to convict him of inconsistency, but so consistent had been his public career that the charge was never even made. Never fanciful or extreme, he was ever solid, firm, and consistent. His administration, viewed from the standpoint of results, was perhaps the greatest in our national history, certainly one of the greatest. He suc-

ceeded because he insisted on being its centre, and in overruling and guiding all his secretaries to act so as to produce unity and harmony. Those who study his administration will acknowledge how sincere and successful were his efforts, as did those who were contemporary with him."

Mr. Polk, who was a patient student and a clear thinker, steadfast to opinions once formed, and not easily moved by popular opinion, labored faithfully, from his entrance into public life until the day when he left the White House, to disseminate the political opinions in which he had been educated, and which commended themselves to his judgment. His private life was upright and blameless. Simple in his habits to abstemiousness, he found his greatest happiness in the pleasures of the home circle rather than in the gay round of public amusements. A frank and sincere friend, courteous and affable in his demeanor with strangers, generous and benevolent, the esteem in which he was held as a man and a citizen was quite as high as his official reputation. In the words of his friend and associate in office, Vice-President Dallas, he was "temperate but not unsocial, industrious but accessible, punctual but patient, moral without austerity, and devotional though not bigoted." See "Eulogy on the Life and Character of the Late James K. Polk," by George M. Dallas (Philadelphia, 1849); "Eulogy on the Life and

Character of James Knox Polk," by A. O. P. Nicholson (Nashville, 1849); "James K. Polk," by John S. Jenkins (Buffalo, 1850); "History of the Administration of James K. Polk," by Lucien B. Chase (New York, 1850); "Diary of James K. Polk During His Presidency, 1845 to 1849," edited by Milo M. Quaife, 4 vols. (Chicago, 1910); and Bancroft's large MSS. collection of Polk's letters and extracts from his diary, extending to twenty-two quarto volumes, now in the possession of the New York Public Library. Referring to these type-written copies, made for him in 1887 with a view to the preparation of the president's life, Mr. Bancroft wrote to a friend: "His character shines out in them just exactly as the man was, prudent, farsighted, bold, exceeding any Democrat of his day in his undeviatingly correct exposition of democratic principles; and, in short, as I think, judging of him as I knew him, and judging of him by the results of his administration, one of the very foremost of our public men, and one of the very best, most honest, and most successful presidents the country ever had."

His wife, SARAH CHILDRESS, born near Murfreesboro, Rutherford County, Tenn., September 4, 1803; died in Nashville, Tenn., August 14, 1891, was the daughter of Joel and Elizabeth Childress. Her father, a farmer in easy circumstances, sent

her to the Moravian institute at Salem, N. C., where she was educated. On returning home, she married Mr. Polk, who was then a member of the legislature of Tennessee. The following year he was elected to congress, and during his fourteen sessions in Washington Mrs. Polk's courteous manners, sound judgment, and many attainments gave her a high place in society. On her return as the wife of the president, having no children, Mrs. Polk devoted herself entirely to her duties as mistress of the White House. She held weekly receptions, and abolished the custom of giving refreshments to the guests. She also forbade dancing, as out of keeping with the character of these entertainments. In spite of her reforms, Mrs. Polk was extremely popular. "Madam," said a prominent South Carolinian, at one of her receptions, "there is a woe pronounced against you in the Bible." On her inquiring his meaning, he added: "The Bible says, 'Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you.'" An English lady visiting Washington thus described the president's wife: "Mrs. Polk is a very handsome woman. Her hair is very black, and her dark eyes and complexion remind one of the Spanish donnas. She is well read, has much talent for conversation, and is highly popular. Her excellent taste in dress preserves the subdued though elegant costume that characterizes the lady." Mrs. Polk became a com-

municant of the Presbyterian church in 1834, and maintained her connection with that denomination until the close of her long life. After the death of her husband she continued to reside at Nashville, in the house known as "Polk Place." In the foreground is the tomb of her husband, by whose side she was buried. The courts, in 1891, having decided that Mr. Polk's will, leaving his estate "to the worthiest of the name forever," was void, as constituting a perpetuity, the tomb, with the remains of President and Mrs. Polk, were removed by the State and reinterred with appropriate public ceremonies on Capitol Hill, Nashville, September 19, 1893, with a view to the division of the land among the heirs.

ZACHARY TAYLOR

BY

JEFFERSON DAVIS

ZACHARY TAYLOR

ZACHARY TAYLOR, twelfth president of the United States, born in Orange County, Va., September 24, 1784; died in the executive mansion, Washington, D. C., July 9, 1850. He was fifth in descent from James Taylor, who came to this country from Carlisle, on the English border, in 1658. His father, Col. Richard Taylor, an officer in the war of the Revolution, was conspicuous for zeal and daring among men in whom personal gallantry was the rule. After the war he retired to private life, and in 1785 removed to Kentucky, then a sparsely occupied county of Virginia, and made his home near the present city of Louisville, where he died. Zachary was the third son. Brought up on a farm in a new settlement, he had few scholastic opportunities; but in the thrift, industry, self-denial, and forethought required by the circumstances, he learned such lessons as were well adapted to form the character illustrated by his eventful career. Yet he had also another form of education. The liberal grants of land that Virginia made to her soldiers caused many of them, after the peace of 1783, to remove to the west; thus Col. Taylor's neighbors included many who had been his fellow-soldiers, and these often met around

his wide hearth. Their conversation would naturally be reminiscences of their military life, and all the sons of Col. Taylor, save one, Hancock, entered the U. S. army. The rapid extension of settlements on the border was productive of frequent collision with the Indians, and almost constantly required the protection of a military force.

In 1808, on the recommendation of President Jefferson, congress authorized the raising of five regiments of infantry, one of riflemen, one of light artillery, and one of light dragoons. From the terms of the act it was understood that this was not to be a permanent increase of the U. S. Army, and many of the officers of the "old army" declined to seek promotion in the new regiments. At this period questions had arisen between the United States and Great Britain which caused serious anticipations of a war with that power, and led many to regard the additional force authorized as a preliminary step in preparation for such a war. Zachary Taylor, then in his twenty-fourth year, applied for a commission, and was appointed a 1st lieutenant in the 7th infantry, one of the new regiments, and in 1810 was promoted to the grade of captain in the same regiment, according to the regulations of the service. He was happily married in 1810 to Miss Margaret Smith, of Calvert County, Md., who shared with him the privations and dangers of his many years of frontier service,



Zachary Taylor

From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C.

and survived him but a short time. The troubles on the frontier continued to increase until 1811, when Gen. William H. Harrison, afterward president of the United States, marched against the stronghold of the Shawnees and fought the battle of Tippecanoe.

In June, 1812, war was declared against England, and this increased the widespread and not unfounded fears of Indian invasion in the valley of the Wabash. To protect Vincennes from sudden assault, Capt. Taylor was ordered to Fort Harrison, a stockade on the river above Vincennes, and with his company of infantry, about fifty strong, made preparations to defend the place. He had not long to wait. A large body of Indians, knowing the smallness of the garrison, came, confidently counting on its capture; but as it is a rule in their warfare to seek by stratagem to avoid equal risk and probable loss, they tried various expedients, which were foiled by the judgment, vigilance, and courage of the commander, and when the final attack was made, the brave little garrison repelled it with such loss to the assailants that when, in the following October, Gen. Hopkins came to support Fort Harrison, no Indians were to be found thereabout. For the defence of Fort Harrison, Capt. Taylor received the brevet of major, an honor that had seldom, if ever before, been conferred for service in Indian war. In the following November,

Maj. Taylor, with a battalion of regulars, formed a part of the command of Gen. Hopkins in the expedition against the hostile Indians at the head-waters of the Wabash. In 1814, with his separate command, he being then a major by commission, he made a campaign against the hostile Indians and their British allies on Rock river, which was so successful as to give subsequent security to that immediate frontier. In such service, not the less hazardous or indicative of merit because on a small scale, he passed the period of his employment on that frontier until the treaty of peace with Great Britain disposed the Indians to be quiet.

After the war, March 3, 1815, a law was enacted to fix the military peace establishment of the United States. By this act the whole force was to be reduced to 10,000 men, with such proportions of artillery, infantry, and riflemen as the president should judge proper. The president was to cause the officers and men of the existing army to be arranged, by unrestricted transfers, so as to form the corps authorized by the recent act, and the supernumeraries were to be discharged. Maj. Taylor had borne the responsibilities and performed the duties of a battalion commander so long and successfully that when the arranging board reduced him to the rank of captain in the new organization he felt the injustice, but resigned from the army without complaint, returned home, and

proceeded, as he said in after years, "to make a crop of corn." Influences that were certainly not employed by him, and are unknown to the writer of this sketch, caused his restoration to the grade of major, and he resumed his place in the army, there to continue until the voice of the people called him to the highest office within their gift. Under the rules that governed promotion in the army, Maj. Taylor became lieutenant-colonel of the 1st infantry, and for a period commanded at Fort Snelling, then the advanced post in the northwest.

In 1832 he became colonel of the 1st infantry, with headquarters at Fort Crawford, Prairie du Chien. The barracks were unfinished, and his practical mind and conscientious attention to every duty were manifest in the progress and completion of the work. The second Black Hawk campaign occurred this year, and Col. Taylor, with the greater part of his regiment, joined the army commanded by Gen. Henry Atkinson, and with it moved from Rock Island up the valley of Rock river, following Black Hawk, who had gone to make a junction with the Pottawattomie band of the Prophet, a nephew of Black Hawk. This was in violation of the treaty he had made with Gen. Edmund P. Gaines in 1831, by which he was required to remove to the west of the Mississippi, relinquishing all claim to the Rock river villages. It was assumed that his purpose in returning to

the east side of the river was hostile, and, from the defenceless condition of the settlers and the horror of savage atrocity, great excitement was created, due rather to his fame as a warrior than to the number of his followers. If, as he subsequently declared, his design was to go and live peaceably with his nephew, the Prophet, rather than with the Foxes, of whom Keokuk was the chief, that design may have been frustrated by the lamentable mistake of some mounted volunteers in hastening forward in pursuit of Black Hawk, who with his band—men, women, and children—was going up on the south side of the Rock river. The pursuers fell into an ambuscade, and were routed with some loss and in great confusion. The event will be remembered by the men of that day as "Stillman's run."

The vanity of the young Indians was inflated by their success, as was shown by some exultant messages; and the sagacious old chief, whatever he may have previously calculated upon, now saw that war was inevitable and immediate. With his band, recruited by warriors from the Prophet's band, he crossed to the north side of Rock river, and, passing through the swamp Koshkenong, fled over the prairies west of the Four Lakes, toward Wisconsin river. Gen. Henry Dodge, with a battalion of mounted miners, overtook the Indians while they were crossing the Wisconsin and attacked their rear-guard, which, when the main body had crossed,

swam the river and joined the retreat over the Kickapoo hills toward the Mississippi. Gen. Atkinson, with his whole army, continued the pursuit, and, after a toilsome march, overtook the Indians north of Prairie du Chien, on the bank of the Mississippi, to the west side of which they were preparing to cross in bark canoes made on the spot. That purpose was foiled by the accidental arrival of a steamboat with a small gun on board. The Indians took cover in a willow marsh, and there was fought the battle of the Bad Axe. The Indians were defeated and dispersed, and the campaign ended. In the meantime, Gen. Winfield Scott, with troops from the east, took chief command and established his headquarters at Rock Island, and thither Gen. Atkinson went with the regular troops, except that part of the 1st infantry which constituted the garrison of Fort Crawford. With these Col. Taylor returned to Prairie du Chien. When it was reported that the Indians were on an island above the prairie, he sent a lieutenant with an appropriate command to explore the island, where unmistakable evidence was found of the recent presence of the Indians and of their departure. Immediately thereafter a group of Indians appeared on the east bank of the river under a white flag, who proved to be Black Hawk, with a remnant of his band and a few friendly Winnebagoes. The lieutenant went with them to

130 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

the fort, where Col. Taylor received them, except the Winnebagoes, as prisoners. A lieutenant and a guard were sent with them, sixty in number—men, women, and children—by steamboat, to Rock Island, there to report to Gen. Scott for orders in regard to the prisoners. Col. Taylor actively participated in the campaign up to its close, and to him was surrendered the chief who had most illustrated the warlike instincts of the Indian race, to whom history must fairly accord the credit of having done much under the most disadvantageous circumstances. In 1836 Col. Taylor was ordered to Florida for service in the Seminole war, and the next year he defeated the Indians in the decisive battle of Okechobee, for which he received the brevet of brigadier-general, and in 1838 was appointed to the chief command in Florida. In 1840 he was assigned to command the southern division of the western department of the army. Though Gen. Taylor had for many years been a cotton-planter, his family had lived with him at his military station, but, when ordered for an indefinite time on field service, he made his family home at Baton Rouge, La.

Texas having been annexed to the United States in 1845, Mexico threatened to invade Texas with the avowed purpose to recover the territory, and Gen. Taylor was ordered to defend it as a part of the United States. He proceeded with all his avail-

able force, about 1,500 men, to Corpus Christi, where he was joined by re-enforcements of regulars and volunteers. Discussion had arisen as to whether the Nueces or the Rio Grande was the proper boundary of Texas. His political opinions, whatever they might be, were subordinate to the duty of a soldier to execute the orders of his government, and, without uttering it, he acted on the apothegm of Decatur: "My country, right or wrong, my country." Texas claimed protection for her frontier, the president recognized the fact that Texas had been admitted to the Union with the Rio Grande as her boundary, and Gen. Taylor was instructed to advance to that river. His force had been increased to about 4,000, when, on March 8, 1846, he marched from Corpus Christi. He was of course conscious of the inadequacy of his division to resist such an army as Mexico might send against it, but when ordered by superior authority it was not his to remonstrate. Gen. Gaines, commanding the western department, had made requisitions for a sufficient number of volunteers to join Taylor, but the secretary of war countermanded them, except as to such as had already joined. Gen. Taylor, with a main depot at Point Isabel, advanced to the bank of the Rio Grande opposite to Matamoras, and there made provision for defence of the place called Fort Brown. Soon after his arrival, Ampudia, the Mexican general at Mata-

132 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

moras, made a threatening demand that Gen. Taylor should withdraw his troops beyond the Nueces, to which he replied that his position had been taken by order of his government, and would be maintained. Having completed the intrenchment, and being short of supplies, he left a garrison to hold it, and marched with an aggregate force of 2,288 men to obtain additional supplies from Point Isabel, about thirty miles distant.

Gen. Arista, the new Mexican commander, availing himself of the opportunity to interpose, crossed the river below Fort Brown with a force estimated at 6,000 regular troops, 10 pieces of artillery, and a considerable amount of auxiliaries. In the afternoon of the second day's march from Point Isabel these were reported by Gen. Taylor's cavalry to be in his front, and he halted to allow the command to rest and for the needful dispositions for battle. In the evening a request was made that a council of war should be held, to which Gen. Taylor assented. The prevalent opinion was in favor of falling back to Point Isabel, there to intrench and wait for re-enforcements. After listening to a full expression of views, the general announced: "I shall go to Fort Brown or stay in my shoes," a western expression equivalent to "or die in the attempt." He then notified the officers to prepare to attack the enemy at dawn of day. In the morning of May 8 the advance was made

by columns until the enemy's batteries opened, when line of battle was formed and Taylor's artillery, inferior in number but otherwise superior, was brought fully into action and soon dispersed the mass of the enemy's cavalry. The chaparral, dense copses of thorn-bushes, served both to conceal the position of the enemy and to impede the movements of the attacking force. The action closed at night, when the enemy retired, and Gen. Taylor bivouacked on the field. Early in the morning of May 9 he resumed his march, and in the afternoon encountered Gen. Arista in a strong position with artillery advantageously posted. Taylor's infantry pushed through the chaparral lining both sides of the road, and drove the enemy's infantry before them; but the batteries held their position, and were so fatally used that it was an absolute necessity to capture them. For this purpose the general ordered a squadron of dragoons to charge them. The enemy's gunners were cut down at their pieces, the commanding officer was captured, and the infantry soon made the victory complete. The Mexican loss in the two battles was estimated at a thousand; the American, killed, forty-nine. The enemy precipitately recrossed the Rio Grande, leaving the usual evidence of a routed army. Gen. Taylor then proceeded to Fort Brown. During his absence it had been heavily bombarded, and the commander, Maj. Brown, had been killed. The

134 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

Mexicans evacuated Matamoras, and Gen. Taylor took possession, May 18.

The Rio Grande, except at time of flood, offered little obstacle to predatory incursions, and it was obviously sound policy to press the enemy back from the border. Gen. Taylor, therefore, moved forward to Camargo, on the San Juan, a tributary of the Rio Grande. This last-named river rose so as to enable steamboats to transport troops and supplies, and by September a sufficiently large force of volunteers had reported at Gen. Taylor's headquarters to justify a further march into the interior, but the move must be by land, and for that there was far from adequate transportation. Hiring Mexican packers to supplement the little transportation on hand, he was able to add one division of volunteers to the regulars of his command, and with a force of 6,625 men of all arms he marched against Monterey, a fortified town of great natural strength, garrisoned by 10,000 men under Gen. Ampudia. On September 19 he encamped before the town, and on the 21st began the attack. On the third day Gen. Ampudia proposed to surrender, commissioners were appointed, and terms of capitulation agreed upon, by which the enemy were to retire beyond a specified line, and the United States forces were not to advance beyond that line during the next eight weeks or until the pleasure of the respective governments

Col. Thomas & his madame, as well as best
regards to Mr. A. Brown, E. H. Taylor Esq.
& Geo. Lecher as well as to any other enqui-
ring friends, and wishing you & yours
continued health & prosperity through a
long life. I remain

Your Friend

Truly & Sincerely
J. Taylor.

should be known. By some strange misconception, the U. S. government disapproved the arrangement, and ordered that the armistice should be terminated, by which we lost whatever had been gained in the interests of peace by the generous terms of the capitulation, and got nothing, for, during the short time that remained unexpired, no provision had been or could be made to enable Gen. Taylor to advance into the heart of Mexico. Presuming that such must be the purpose of the government, he assiduously strove to collect the means for that object. When his preparations were well-nigh perfected, Gen. Scott was sent to Mexico with orders that enabled him at discretion to strip Gen. Taylor of both troops and material of war, to be used on another line of operations. The projected campaign against the capital of Mexico was to be from Vera Cruz, up the steppes, and against the fortifications that had been built to resist any probable invasion, instead of from Saltillo, across the plains to the comparatively undefended capital. The difficulty on this route was the waterless space to be crossed, and against that Gen. Taylor had ingeniously provided. According to instructions, he went to Victoria, Mexico, turned over his troops, except a proper escort to return through a country of hostiles to Monterey, and then went to Agua Nueva, beyond Saltillo,

where he was joined by Gen. Wool with his command from Chihuahua.


Gen. Santa-Anna saw the invitation offered by the withdrawal of Gen. Taylor's troops, and with a well-appointed army, 20,000 strong, marched with the assurance of easily recovering their lost territory. Gen. Taylor fell back to the narrow pass in front of the hacienda of Buena Vista, and here stood on the defensive. His force was 5,400 of all arms; but of these only three batteries of artillery, one squadron of dragoons, one mounted company of Texans, and one regiment of Mississippi riflemen had ever been under fire. Some skirmishing occurred on February 22, and a general assault along the whole line was made on the morning of the 23d. The battle, with varying fortune, continued throughout the day; at evening the enemy retired, and during the night retreated by the route on which he had advanced, having suffered much by the casualties of battle, but still more by desertions. So Santa-Anna returned with but a remnant of the regular army of Mexico, on which reliance had been placed to repel invasion, and thenceforward peace was undisturbed in the valley of the Rio Grande. At that time Gen. Taylor's capacity was not justly estimated, his golden silence being often misunderstood. His reply to Sec. Marcy's strictures in regard to the capitulation of Monterey exhibited such vigor of thought

and grace of expression that many attributed it to a member of his staff who had a literary reputation. It was written by Gen. Taylor's own hand, in the open air, by his camp-fire at Victoria, Mexico.

Many years of military routine had not dulled his desire for knowledge; he had extensively studied both ancient and modern history, especially the English. Unpretending, meditative, observant, and conclusive, he was best understood and most appreciated by those who had known him long and intimately. In a campaign he gathered information from all who approached him, however sinister their motive might be. By comparison and elimination he gained a knowledge that was often surprising as to the position and designs of the enemy. In battle he was vigilantly active, though quiet in bearing; calm and considerate, though stern and inflexible; but when the excitement of danger and strife had subsided, he had a father's tenderness for the wounded, and none more sincerely mourned for those who had bravely fallen in the line of their duty.

Before his nomination for the presidency Gen. Taylor had no political aspirations and looked forward to the time when he should retire from the army as the beginning of a farmer's life. He had planned for his retreat a stock-farm in the hills of Jefferson County, behind his cotton-plantation on

the Mississippi river. In his case, as in some other notable instances, the fact of not desiring office rather increased than diminished popular confidence, so that unseeking he was sought. From early manhood he had served continually in the U. S. army. His duties had led him to consider the welfare of the country as one and indivisible, and his opinions were free from party or sectional intensity. Conscious of his want of knowledge of the machinery of the civil service, he formed his cabinet to supplement his own information. They were men well known to the public by the eminent civil stations they had occupied, and were only thus known to Gen. Taylor, who as president had literally no friends to reward and no enemies to punish. The cabinet was constituted as follows: John M. Clayton, of Delaware, secretary of state; William M. Meredith, of Pennsylvania, secretary of the treasury; George W. Crawford, of Georgia, secretary of war; W. Ballard Preston, of Virginia, secretary of the navy; Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, attorney-general; Alexander H. H. Stuart, of Virginia, secretary of the interior. All these had served in the U. S. senate or the house of representatives, and all were lawyers. Taylor was the popular hero of a foreign war which had been victoriously ended, bringing to the United States a large acquisition of territory with an alluring harvest of gold, but, all unheeded, bringing also a



HOME OF ZACHARY TAYLOR, NEAR LOUISVILLE, KY.

large addition to the elements of sectional contention. These were soon developed, and while the upper air was calm and the sun of prosperity shone brightly on the land, the attentive listener could hear the rumbling sound of approaching convulsion.

President Taylor, with the keen watchfulness and intuitive perception that had characterized him as a commander in the field, easily saw and appreciated the danger; but before it had reached the stage for official action he died. His party and local relations, being a Whig and a southern planter, gave him the vantage-ground for the exercise of a restraining influence in the threatened contest. His views, matured under former responsibilities, were tersely given to confidential friends, but as none of his cabinet are living (Stuart was the last survivor), their consultations cannot be learned unless from preserved manuscript. During the brief period of his administration the rules that would govern it were made manifest, and no law for civil-service reform was needful for his guidance. With him the bestowal of office was a trust held for the people; it was not to be gained by proof of party zeal and labor. The fact of holding Democratic opinions was not a disqualification for the office. Nepotism had with him no quarter. Gen. Winfield Scott related to the writer an anecdote that may appropriately close this sketch. He said he had remarked to his wife that

Gen. Taylor was an upright man, to which she replied: "He is not"; that he insisted his long acquaintance should enable him to judge better than she. But she persisted in her denial, and he asked: "Then what manner of man is he?" when she said: "He is a downright man."

As president he had purity, patriotism, and discretion to guide him in his new field of duty, and had he lived long enough to stamp his character on his administration, it would have been found that the great soldier was equally fitted to be the head of a government. He was buried in the family cemetery, five miles from Louisville. Gen. Taylor's life was written by Joseph R. Fry and Robert T. Conrad (Philadelphia, 1848), by John Frost (New York, 1848), and by Gen. O. O. Howard, in the "Great Commanders" series (1892).

His wife, MARGARET, born in Calvert County, Md., in 1790; died near Pascagoula, La., August 18, 1852, was the daughter of Walter Smith, a Maryland planter. He was descended from Richard Smith, who was appointed Attorney-General of Maryland by Oliver Cromwell. She received a home education, married early in life, and, until her husband's election to the presidency, resided with him chiefly in garrisons or on the frontier. During the Florida war she established herself at Tampa bay, and did good service among the sick

and wounded in the hospitals there. Mrs. Taylor was without social ambition, and when Gen. Taylor became president she reluctantly accepted her responsibilities, regarding the office as a "plot to deprive her of her husband's society and to shorten his life by unnecessary care." She surrendered to her youngest daughter the superintendence of the household, and took no part in social duties. Her eldest daughter, ANN, married Dr. Robert Wood, Assistant-Surgeon-General of the Army. Another daughter, SARAH KNOX, became the wife of Jefferson Davis, the marriage taking place near Louisville, Ky., the bride's uncle, Hancock Taylor, acting for her father, who was then with his command on the frontier.

Another daughter, ELIZABETH, born in Jefferson County, Ky., in 1824, was educated in Philadelphia, married Maj. William W. S. Bliss in her nineteenth year, and, on her father's inauguration, became mistress of the White House. Mrs. Bliss, or Miss Betty, as she was popularly called, was a graceful and accomplished hostess, and, it is said, "did the honors of the establishment with the artlessness of a rustic belle and the grace of a duchess." After the death of her distinguished father in 1850, and her husband in 1853, she spent several years in retirement, subsequently marrying Philip Pendleton Dandridge, of Winchester, Va., whom

she survived, and died there in 1910, the last of General Taylor's children.

His only son, RICHARD, soldier, born in Jefferson County, Ky., January 27, 1826; died in New York city, April 12, 1879, was sent to Edinburgh when thirteen years old, where he spent three years in studying the classics, and then a year in France. He entered the junior class at Yale in 1843, and was graduated there in 1845. He was a wide and voracious though a desultory reader. From college he went to his father's camp on the Rio Grande, and he was present at Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma. His health then became impaired, and he returned home. He resided on a cotton-plantation in Jefferson County, Miss., until 1849, when he removed to a sugar-estate in St. Charles Parish, Louisiana, about twenty miles above New Orleans, where he was residing when the civil war began. He was in the state senate from 1856 to 1860, was a delegate to the Charleston Democratic convention in 1860, and afterward to that at Baltimore, and was a member of the Secession convention of Louisiana. As a member of the military committee, he aided the governor in organizing troops, and in June, 1861, went to Virginia as colonel of the 9th Louisiana volunteers. The day he reached Richmond he left for Manassas, arriving there at dusk on the day of the

battle. In the autumn he was made a brigadier-general, and in the spring of 1862 he led his brigade in the valley campaign under "Stonewall" Jackson. He distinguished himself at Front Royal, Middletown, Winchester, Strasburg, Cross Keys, and Port Republic, and Jackson recommended him for promotion. Taylor was also with Jackson in the seven days' battles before Richmond. He was promoted to major-general, and assigned to the command of Louisiana. The fatigues and exposures of his campaigns there brought on a partial and temporary paralysis of the lower limbs; but in August he assumed command. The only communication across the Mississippi retained by the Confederates was between Vicksburg and Port Hudson; but Taylor showed great ability in raising, organizing, supplying, and handling an army, and he gradually won back the state west of the Mississippi from the National forces. He had reclaimed the whole of this when Vicksburg fell, July 4, 1863, and was then compelled to fall back west of Berwick's bay.

Gen. Taylor's principal achievement during the war was his defeat of Gen. Nathaniel P. Banks at Sabine Cross-Roads, near Mansfield, De Soto Parish, La., April 8, 1864. With 8,000 men he attacked the advance of the northern army and routed it, capturing twenty-two guns and a large number of prisoners. He followed Banks, who

fell back to Pleasant Hill, and on the next day again attacked him, when Taylor was defeated, losing the fruits of the first day's victory. These two days' fighting have been frequently compared to that of Shiloh—a surprise and defeat on the first day, followed by a substantial victory of the National forces on the second. In the summer of 1864 Taylor was promoted to be a lieutenant-general, and ordered to the command of the Department of Alabama, Mississippi, etc. Here he was able merely to protract the contest, while the great armies decided it. After Lee and Johnston capitulated there was nothing for him, and he surrendered to Gen. Edward R. S. Canby, at Citronelle, May 8, 1865. The war left Taylor ruined in fortune, and he soon went abroad. Returning home, he took part in politics as an adviser, and his counsel was held in esteem by Samuel J. Tilden in his presidential canvass. During this period he wrote his memoir of the war, entitled "Destruction and Reconstruction" (New York, 1879).

MILLARD FILLMORE


BY

JAMES GRANT WILSON

MILLARD FILLMORE

MILLARD FILLMORE, thirteenth president of the United States, born in the township of Locke (now Summerhill), Cayuga County, N. Y., January 7, 1800; died in Buffalo, N. Y., March 7, 1874. The name of Fillmore is of English origin, and at different periods has been variously written. Including the son of the ex-president, the family can be traced through six generations, and, as has been said of that of Washington, its history gives proof "of the lineal and enduring worth of race." The first of the family to appear in the New World was a certain John Fillmore, who, in a conveyance of two acres of land dated November 24, 1704, is described as a "mariner of Ipswich," Mass. His eldest son, of the same name, born two years before the purchase of the real estate in Beverly, also became a sea-faring man, and while on a voyage in the sloop "Dolphin," of Cape Ann, was captured with all on board by the pirate Capt. John Phillips. For nearly nine months Fillmore and his three companions in captivity were compelled to serve on the pirate ship and to submit, during that long period, to many hardships and much cruel treat-

ment. After watching and waiting for an opportunity to obtain their freedom, their hour at length came. While Fillmore sent an axe crashing through the skull of Burrall, the boatswain, the captain and other officers were despatched by his companions, and the ship was won. They sailed her into Boston harbor, and the same court which condemned the brigands of the sea presented John Fillmore with the captain's silver-hilted sword and other articles, which are preserved to this day by his descendants. The sword was inherited by his son, Nathaniel, and was made good use of in both the French and Revolutionary wars. Lieut. Fillmore's second son, who also bore the name Nathaniel, and who was the father of the president, went with his young wife, Phebe Millard, to what at the close of the past century was the "far west," where he and a younger brother built a log cabin in the wilderness, and there his second son, Millard, was born. Nathaniel Fillmore was one of "God Almighty's gentlemen," whose creed was contained in two words, "do right," and who lived to see his son elevated to the highest position in his native land. Of the president's mother, who died in the summer of 1831, little is known beyond the fact that she was a sensible and, in her later years, a sickly woman; with a sunny nature that enabled her to endure uncomplainingly the many hardships of a frontier life, and that her closing days were



Millard Fillmore

From a photograph by Baker, Buffalo, N. Y.

gladdened by the frequent visits of her son, who was then in public life, with every prospect of a successful professional and political career.

From a brief manuscript autobiography prepared by "worthy Mr. Fillmore," as Washington Irving described him, we learn that, owing to a defective title, his father lost his property on what was called the "military tract," and removed to another part of the same county, now known as Niles, where he took a perpetual lease of 130 acres, wholly unimproved and covered with heavy timber. It was here that the future president first knew anything of life. Working for nine months on the farm, and attending such primitive schools as then existed in that neighborhood for the other three months of the year, he had an opportunity of forgetting during the summer what he acquired in the winter, for in those days there were no newspapers and magazines to be found in pioneers' cabins, and his father's library consisted of but two books—the Bible and a collection of hymns. He never saw a copy of "Shakespeare" or "Robinson Crusoe," a history of the United States, or even a map of his own country, till he was nineteen years of age! Nathaniel Fillmore's misfortunes in losing his land through a defective title, and again in taking another tract of exceedingly poor soil, gave him a distaste for farming, and made him desirous that his sons should follow other occupations. As his means

did not justify him or them in aspiring to any profession, he wished them to learn trades, and accordingly Millard, then a sturdy youth of fourteen, was apprenticed for a few months on trial to the business of carding wool and dressing cloth. During his apprenticeship he was, as the youngest, treated with great injustice, and on one occasion his employer, for some expression of righteous resentment, threatened to chastise him, when the young woodsman, burning with indignation, raised the axe with which he was at work, and told him the attempt would cost him his life. Most fortunate for both, the attempt was not made, and at the close of his term he shouldered his knapsack, containing a few clothes and a supply of bread and dried venison, and set out on foot and alone for his father's house, a distance of something more than a hundred miles through the primeval forests. Mr. Fillmore in his autobiography remarks: "I think that this injustice—which was no more than other apprentices have suffered and will suffer—had a marked effect on my character. It made me feel for the weak and unprotected, and to hate the insolent tyrant in every station of life."

In 1815 the youth again began the business of carding and cloth-dressing, which was carried on from June to December of each year. The first book that he purchased or owned was a small English dictionary, which he diligently studied while

attending the carding machine. In 1819 he conceived the design of becoming a lawyer. Fillmore, who had yet two years of his apprenticeship to serve, agreed with his employer to relinquish his wages for the last year's services, and promised to pay thirty dollars for his time. Making an arrangement with a retired country lawyer, by which he was to receive his board in payment for his services in the office, he began the study of law, a part of the time teaching school, and so struggling on, overcoming almost insurmountable difficulties, till at length, in the spring of 1823, he was, at the intercession of several leading members of the Buffalo bar, whose confidence he had won, admitted as an attorney by the court of common pleas of Erie County, although he had not completed the course of study usually required. The writer has recently seen the dilapidated one-story building in Buffalo where Mr. Fillmore closed his career as a school-master, and has also conversed with one of his pupils of four-score years ago. The wisdom of his youth and early manhood gave presage of all that was witnessed and admired in the maturity of his character. Nature laid on him, in the kindly phrase of Wordsworth, "the strong hand of her purity," and even then he was remarked for that sweet courtesy of manner which accompanied him through life. Millard Fillmore began practice at Aurora, where his father then resided, and for-

tunately won his first case and a fee of four dollars. In 1827 he was admitted as an attorney, and two years later as counsellor of the supreme court of the state. In 1830 he removed to Buffalo, and after a brief period formed a partnership with Nathan K. Hall, to which Solomon G. Haven was soon afterward admitted.

By hard study and the closest application, combined with honesty and fidelity, Mr. Fillmore soon became a sound and successful lawyer, attaining a highly honorable position in the profession. The law-firm of Fillmore, Hall & Haven, which continued till 1847, was perhaps the most prominent in western New York, and was usually engaged in every important suit occurring in that portion of the state. In 1853, while still in Washington, Mr. Fillmore made an arrangement with Henry E. Davies to renew, on retiring from the presidency, the practice of his profession in New York, in partnership with that gentleman, who, after occupying a judge's seat in the court of appeals, returned to the bar. Family afflictions, however, combined with other causes, induced the ex-president to abandon his purpose. There were doubtless at that time men of more genius and greater eloquence at the bar of the great city; but we cannot doubt that Mr. Fillmore's solid legal learning, and the weight of his personal character, would have won for him

the highest professional honors in the new field of action.

Mr. Fillmore's political career began and ended with the birth and extinction of the great Whig party. In 1828 he was elected by Erie County to the state legislature of New York, serving for three terms, and retiring with a reputation for ability, integrity, and a conscientious performance of his public duties. He distinguished himself by his advocacy of the act to abolish imprisonment for debt, which was passed in 1831. The bill was drafted by Fillmore, excepting the portion relative to proceedings in courts of record, which was drawn by John C. Spencer. In 1832 he was elected to congress, and, after serving for one term, retired until 1836, when he was re-elected, and again returned in 1838 and 1840, declining a renomination in 1842. In the 27th congress Mr. Fillmore, as chairman of the committee on ways and means—a committee performing at that period not only the duties now devolving upon it, but those also which belong to the committee on appropriations—had herculean labors to perform. Day after day, for weeks and months, Fillmore had to encounter many of the ablest debaters of the house, but on all occasions he proved himself equal to the emergency. It should not be forgotten that, in the opinion of John Quincy Adams, there were more men of talent and a larger aggregate of ability in that congress

than he had ever known. Although Mr. Fillmore did not claim to have discovered any original system of revenue, still the tariff of 1842 was a new creation, and he is most justly entitled to the distinction of being its author. It operated successfully, giving immediate life to our languishing industries and national credit. At the same time Mr. Fillmore, with great labor, prepared a digest of the laws authorizing all appropriations reported by him to the house as chairman of the committee on ways and means, so that on the instant he could produce the legal authority for every expenditure which he recommended. Sensible that this was a great safeguard against improper expenditures, he procured the passage of a resolution requiring the departments, when they submitted estimates of expenses, to accompany them with a reference to the laws authorizing them in each and every instance. This has ever since been the practice of the United States government.

Mr. Fillmore retired from congress in 1843, and was a candidate for the office of vice-president, supported by his own and several of the western states, in the Whig convention that met at Baltimore in May, 1844. In the following September he was nominated by acclamation for governor, but was defeated by Silas Wright, his illustrious contemporary, Henry Clay being vanquished at the same time in the presidential contest by James K. Polk.

In 1847 Fillmore was elected comptroller of the state of New York, an office which then included many duties now distributed among other departments. In his report of January 1, 1849, he suggested that a national bank, with the stocks of the United States as the sole basis upon which to issue its currency, might be established and carried on, so as to prove a great convenience to the government, with perfect safety to the people. This idea involves the essential principle of our present system of national banks.

In June, 1848, Millard Fillmore was nominated by the Whig national convention for vice-president, with Gen. Taylor, who had recently won military renown in Mexico, as president, and was in the following November elected, making, with the late occupant of the office, seven vice-presidents of the United States from New York, a greater number than has been yet furnished by any other state. In February, 1849, Fillmore resigned the comptrollership, and on March 5 he was inaugurated as vice-president. In 1826 Calhoun, of South Carolina, then vice-president, established the rule that that officer had no authority to call senators to order. During the heated controversies in the session of 1849-'50, occasioned by the application of California for admission into the Union, the vexed question of slavery in the new territories, and that of the rendition of fugitive slaves, in which the

most acrimonious language was used, Mr. Fillmore, in a forcible speech to the senate, announced his determination to maintain order, and that, should occasion require, he should resume the usage of his predecessors upon that point. This announcement met with unanimous approval of the senate, which directed the vice-president's remarks to be entered in full on its journal. He presided during the exciting controversy on Clay's "omnibus bill" with his usual impartiality, and so perfectly even did he hold the scales that no one knew which policy he approved excepting the president, to whom he privately stated that, should he be required to deposit a casting vote, it would be in favor of Henry Clay's bill. More than seven months of the session had been exhausted in angry controversy, when, on July 9, 1850, the country was startled by the news of President Taylor's death. He passed away in the second year of his presidency, suddenly and most unexpectedly, of a violent fever, which was brought on by long exposure to the excessive heat of a fourth of July sun, while he was attending the public ceremonies of the day.

It was a critical moment in the history of our country when Millard Fillmore was on Wednesday, July 10, 1850, made president of the United States. With great propriety he reduced the ceremony of his inauguration to an official act to be marked by

solemnity without joy; and so, with an absence of the usual heralding of trumpet and shawm, he was unostentatiously sworn into his great office in the hall of representatives, in the presence of both houses. The chief justice of the circuit court of the District of Columbia—the venerable William Cranch, appointed fifty years before by President John Adams—administered the oath, which being done, the new president bowed and retired, and the ceremony was at an end. Mr. Fillmore was then in the prime of life, possessing that which to the heathen philosopher seemed the greatest of all blessings—a sound mind in a sound body. The portrait which appears in this work is after a photograph taken in Buffalo some twenty years later. Of Fillmore's keen appreciation of the responsibility devolving on him we have the evidence of letters written at that time, in which he says he should despair but for his humble reliance on God to help him in the honest, fearless, and faithful discharge of his great duties. President Taylor's cabinet immediately resigned, and a new and exceedingly able one was selected by Mr. Fillmore, with Daniel Webster as secretary of state; Thomas Corwin, secretary of the treasury; William A. Graham, secretary of the navy; Charles M. Conrad, secretary of war; Alexander H. H. Stuart, secretary of the interior; John J. Crittenden, attorney-general; and

Nathan K. Hall, postmaster-general.* Of these, Mr. Webster died, and Messrs. Graham and Hall retired in 1852, and were respectively replaced by Edward Everett, John P. Kennedy, and Samuel D. Hubbard. Stuart, of Virginia, who died February 13, 1891, was the last survivor of the illustrious men who aided Mr. Fillmore in guiding the ship of state during the most appalling political tempest, save one, which ever visited this fair land.

It is certainly not the writer's wish to reawaken party feelings or party prejudice or to recall those great questions of pith and moment which so seriously disturbed congress and the country in the first days of Fillmore's administration, but yet, even in so cursory a glance as we are now taking of his career, some comment would seem to be called for in respect to those public acts connected with slavery which appear to have most unreasonably and unjustly lost him the support of a large proportion of his party in the northern states. Whatever the wisdom of Mr. Fillmore's course may have been,

* Buffalo enjoys the distinction of having given the country two presidents. It is a singular coincidence that both these chief magistrates should appoint their former law partners to the office of postmaster-general. Mr. Fillmore selected his partner, Judge Nathan Kelsey Hall, for that office. Judge Hall studied law in the office of Mr. Fillmore at Aurora. He was admitted to the bar in 1832, and became a copartner with his preceptor, who in the meantime had removed to Buffalo. For postmaster-general in his second administration, Mr. Cleveland selected Wilson Shannon Bissell, for many years his law partner in Buffalo.

it is impossible to doubt his patriotism or his honest belief that he was acting in accordance with his oath to obey the constitution of his country. The president's dream was peace—to preserve without hatred and without war tranquillity throughout the length and breadth of our broad land, and if in indulging this delusive dream he erred, it was surely an error that leaned to virtue's side. There is a legend that "he serves his party best who serves his country best." In Mr. Fillmore's action it is confidently believed that he thought not of party or of personal interests, but only of his bounden duty to his country and her sacred constitution.

One of the president's earliest official acts was to send a military force to New Mexico to protect that territory from invasion by Texas on account of its disputed boundary. Then followed the passage by a large majority of the celebrated compromise measures, including the fugitive-slave law. The president referred to the attorney-general the question of its constitutionality, and that officer in a written opinion decided that it was constitutional. Fillmore and the strong cabinet that he had called around him concurred unanimously in this opinion, and the act was signed, together with the other compromise measures. The fugitive-slave law was exceedingly obnoxious to a large portion of the Whig party of the north, as well as to the anti-slavery men, and its execution was resisted. Slaves

in several instances were rescued from the custody of the United States marshals, and a few citizens of Christiana, in Pennsylvania, were killed. Although it was admitted that Fillmore's administration as a whole was able, useful, and patriotic, although his purity as a public man was above suspicion, and no other act of his administration could be called unpopular, still, by the signing and attempted enforcement of the fugitive-slave law and some of its unfortunate provisions, of which even Mr. Webster did not approve, the president, as has been already stated, lost the friendship and support of a large portion of his party in the north.

Mr. Fillmore's administration being in a political minority in both houses of congress, many wise and admirable measures recommended by him failed of adoption; nevertheless we are indebted to him for cheap postage; for the extension of the national capitol, the corner-stone of which he laid July 4, 1851; for the Perry treaty, opening the ports of Japan, and for various valuable exploring expeditions. When South Carolina in one of her indignant utterances took Mr. Fillmore to task for sending a fleet to Charleston harbor, and he was officially questioned as to his object and authority, the answer came promptly and to the purpose, "By authority of the constitution of the United States, which has made the president commander-in-chief of the army and navy, and who recognizes no re-

sponsibility for his official action to the governor of South Carolina." With stern measures he repressed filibustering, and with equal firmness exacted from other countries respect for our flag. Mr. Fillmore carried out strictly the doctrine of non-intervention in the affairs of foreign nations, and frankly stated his policy to the highly gifted Kossuth, who won all hearts by his surpassing eloquence. At the same time, however, it was clearly shown how little the administration sympathized with Austria by the celebrated letter addressed to her ambassador, Hülsemann, by Daniel Webster, who died soon after. His successor as secretary of state was Edward Everett, whose brief term of office was distinguished by his letter declining the proposition for a treaty by which England, France, and the United States were to disclaim then and for the future all intention to obtain possession of Cuba. In his last message, however, the president expressed an opinion against the incorporation of the island with this Union.

Nothing in Mr. Fillmore's presidential career was, during the closing years of his life, regarded by himself with greater satisfaction than the suppressed portion of his last message of December 6, 1852. It was suppressed by the advice of the cabinet, all of whom concurred in the belief that, if sent in, it would precipitate an armed collision, and he readily acquiesced in their views. It related

to the great political problem of the period—the balance of power between the free and the slave states. He fully and clearly appreciated the magnitude of the then approaching crisis, and in the document now under consideration proposed a judicious scheme of rescuing the country from the horrors of a civil war, which soon after desolated so large a portion of the land. His perfectable plan was one of African colonization, somewhat similar to one seriously entertained by his successor, Mr. Lincoln. Had President Fillmore's scheme been adopted, there are some who think that it would have been successful, and that our country might have been blessed with peace and prosperity, in lieu of the late war with its loss of half a million of precious lives and a debt of more than double the amount of the estimated cost of his plan of colonization. Mr. Fillmore retired from the presidency March 4, 1853, leaving the country at peace with other lands and within her own borders, and in the enjoyment of a high degree of prosperity in all the various departments of industry. In his cabinet there had never been a dissenting voice in regard to any important measure of his administration, and, upon his retiring from office, a letter was addressed to him by all its members, expressing their united appreciation of his ability, his integrity, and his single-hearted and sincere devotion to the public service.

The last surviving member of Fillmore's cabinet, who also sat in the 27th congress with him, in a communication, with which he favored the writer, says: "Mr. Fillmore was a man of decided opinions, but he was always open to conviction. His aim was truth, and whenever he was convinced by reasoning that his first impressions were wrong, he had the moral courage to surrender them. But, when he had carefully examined a question and had satisfied himself that he was right, no power on earth could induce him to swerve from what he believed to be the line of duty. . . . There were many things about Mr. Fillmore, aside from his public character, which often filled me with surprise. While he enjoyed none of the advantages of early association with cultivated society, he possessed a grace and polish of manner which fitted him for the most refined circles of the metropolis. You saw, too, at a glance, that there was nothing in it which was assumed, but that it was the natural outward expression of inward refinement and dignity of character. I have witnessed, on several occasions, the display by him of attributes apparently of the most opposite character. When assailed in congress he exhibited a manly self-reliance and a lofty courage which commanded the admiration of every spectator, and yet no one ever manifested deeper sensibility, or more tender sympathy, with a friend in affliction. . . . He seemed to have the peculiar

faculty of adapting himself to every position in which he was called to serve his country. When he was chairman of the committee of ways and means, members of congress expressed their sense of his fitness by declaring that he was born to fill it. When he was elected vice-president, it was predicted that he would fail as the presiding officer of the senate, yet he acquitted himself in this new and untried position in such a manner as to command the applause of senators. And when advanced to the highest office of our country, he so fulfilled his duties as to draw forth the commendation of the ablest men of the opposite party For the last two years of my official association with Mr. Fillmore," adds Mr. Stuart, "our relations, both personal and political, were of an intimate and confidential character. He knew that I was his steadfast friend, and he reciprocated the feeling. He talked with me freely and without reserve about men and measures, and I take pleasure in saying that in all my intercourse with him I never knew him to utter a sentiment or do an act which, in my judgment, would have been unworthy of Washington."

His gifted contemporary, Henry Clay, thought highly of Fillmore's moderation and wisdom, said his administration was an able and honorable one, and on his death-bed recommended his nomination for the presidency (by the Baltimore convention

Buffalo, May 13. '72

My Dear Sir

Your favor of the
8th has just come to hand, as I
am on the point of leaving
with Mrs. F. for New York; where
I hope to have the pleasure of
seeing you, and then I shall be
very happy to do any thing for
you in my power. I shall
stop at the 5th Avenue Hotel.

In haste truly yours
Millard Fillmore

of 1852), as being a statesman of large civil experience, and one in whose career there was nothing inconsistent with the highest purity and patriotism. After leaving Washington for the last time, Webster said to a friend that Fillmore's administration—leaving out of the question his own share of its work—was no doubt the ablest the country had possessed for many years. The same great statesman, in his speech at the laying of the corner-stone of the capitol extension, said: "President Fillmore, it is your singularly good fortune to perform an act such as that which the earliest of your predecessors performed fifty-eight years ago. You stand where he stood; you lay your hand on the corner-stone he laid. Changed, changed is everything around. The same sun, indeed, shone upon his head which shines upon yours. The same broad river rolled at his feet, and now bathes his last resting-place, which now rolls at yours. But the site of this city was then mainly an open field. Streets and avenues have since been laid out and completed, squares and public grounds inclosed and ornamented, until the city, which bears his name, although comparatively inconsiderable in numbers and wealth, has become quite fit to be the seat of government of a great and united people. Sir, may the consequences of the duty which you perform so auspiciously to-day equal those which flowed from his act. Nor this only; may the principles of

your administration and the wisdom of your political conduct be such that the world of the present day and all history hereafter may be at no loss to perceive what example you made your study."

It should be stated as a part of Mr. Fillmore's public record that he was a candidate for nomination as president at the Whig convention of 1852; but although his policy, the fugitive-slave law included, was approved by a vote of 227 against 60, he could not command 20 votes from the free states. Four years later, while at Rome, he received the news of his nomination for the presidency by the American party. He accepted the nomination, but before the close of the campaign it became evident that the real struggle was between the Republicans and Democrats. Many, with whom Fillmore was the first choice for president, cast their votes for Gen. Frémont or James Buchanan, believing that there was no hope of his election, and, although he received the support of large numbers in all the states, Maryland alone gave him her electoral vote. In the summer of 1864 Col. Ogle Tayloe, of Washington, wrote to Mr. Fillmore on the subject of the presidential nomination, and his response was: "I can assure you in all sincerity that I have no desire ever to occupy that exalted station again, and more especially at a time like this." Apropos of letters, the writer had the privilege of perusing a collection

of confidential correspondence written by President Fillmore during a score of years while in public life; and, after a most careful examination, failed to find a single passage that would not stand the light of day, not a word of ignoble office-seeking, no paltry tricks to gain notoriety, no base designs of fattening upon public plunder.

Having thus glanced at the professional and political career of Mr. Fillmore, it now only remains to allude very briefly to his private life from 1853 onward. "The circles of our felicities make short arches." Who shall question the wise axiom of Sir Thomas Browne, the brave old knight of Norwich, a favorite author with the president? Three weeks after the close of his administration he sustained a severe affliction in the loss of his wife, Abigail Powers, the daughter of a clergyman, whom he married February 5, 1826, and who was emphatically her husband's "right-hand." She had long been a sufferer from ill health and was looking forward most eagerly to a return to her old home, when she was taken away to those temples not made with hands. Irving says that she received her death-warrant while standing by his side on the cold marble terrace of the capitol, listening to the inaugural address of Mr. Fillmore's successor. To this Christian lady the White House is indebted for the books which to-day make the library one of the most attractive rooms in the

presidential mansion. In the following year their only daughter, who had grown to womanhood, also passed away, leaving a memory precious to all who had the privilege of her acquaintance. His home, now lonely from the loss of those who spread around it sunshine and happiness, induced Mr. Fillmore to carry out a long-cherished project of visiting the Old World, and in May, 1855, he sailed in the steamer "Atlantic." During his visit to England he received numerous and gratifying attentions from the queen and her cabinet ministers, and was proffered the degree of D.C.L. by the University of Oxford, through its chancellor, the Earl of Derby, the gifted orator who was known as the "Rupert of debate." This honor he however declined, as did Charles Francis Adams a few years later while American minister to the court of St. James. They were alike indisposed to submit to the scenes usual on such occasions.

We can not dwell as we could wish on Mr. Fillmore's patriotic attitude during the early years of the late war; of his warm interest in all the charitable Christian work of the city in which he passed nearly half a century; of his establishing the Buffalo historical society; how, as the first citizen of Buffalo, he was called upon to welcome distinguished visitors, including Mr. Lincoln, when on his way to Washington in 1861, and frequently to preside over conventions and other public gather-

ings, for the control of which he was so admirably qualified by his thorough parliamentary abilities, his widely extended knowledge, his broad views, and a personal urbanity which nothing could disturb; of the method and exactness, the precision and punctuality, with which he conducted his private affairs, as in earlier years he had performed his professional and public duties; of another visit to Europe in 1866, accompanied by his second wife, Caroline C. McIntosh, who survived him for seven years; of his manner of life in dignified retirement, surrounded by all the comfort and luxuries of a beautiful and well-appointed mansion, including a large library, and with an attached wife to share his happy home. In a letter written to his friend Mr. Corcoran, of Washington, but a few weeks before the inevitable hour came, he remarks: "I am happy to say that my health is perfect. I eat, drink, and sleep as well as ever, and take a deep but silent interest in public affairs, and if Mrs. Fillmore's health can be restored, I should feel that I was in the enjoyment of an earthly paradise."

The ex-president accepted an invitation to meet the surviving members of his cabinet and a few other valued friends at the residence of Mr. Corcoran. The month of January, 1874, was designated as the date of the meeting, but was afterward changed to April, by Mr. Fillmore's request. Before that time he was no longer among the liv-

170 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

ing. After a short illness, at ten minutes past eleven o'clock, on Sunday evening, March 8, Millard Fillmore

"Gave his honors to the world again,

His blessed part to heaven, and slept in peace."

He was gathered to his fathers at the ripe age of seventy-four years, and passed away without the knowledge that his former partner, Judge Hall, with whom he had been so long and so closely united in the bonds of friendship, as well as in professional and political life, had also, a few days previous, rested from his labors, and was then lying in the Forest Lawn cemetery, where the ex-president now sleeps by his side.

A phenomenal instance of literary vandalism occurred in the city of Buffalo, early in 1891, when all the valuable letters and documents relating to the administration of Millard Fillmore were destroyed by the executor of the ex-president's only son, Millard Powers Fillmore (he died November 15, 1889), whose will contained a mandate to that effect. Why he should have wished in this way to destroy an important part of the history of his country, as well as of his father's honorable career, or why any intelligent lawyer should have consigned to the flames thousands of papers by Webster and other illustrious men without at least causing copies of the most valuable of them to be made, is entirely beyond the comprehension of



HOME OF MILLARD FILLMORE, NIAGARA SQUARE, BUFFALO, N. Y., AS IT APPEARS AT THE
PRESENT TIME

ordinary mortals. To the writer, in pointing out his carefully preserved papers, contained in the library of his beautiful home in Buffalo, the ex-president said: "In those cases can be found every important letter and document which I received during my administration, and which will enable the future historian or biographer to prepare an authentic account of that period of our country's history." The only opportunity probably that ever would present itself for properly defending and explaining the signing of the fugitive-slave bill; the existence of an unquestioned and strong public sentiment in favor of the president's doing so; the recommendations that the act be done, made by Mr. Fillmore's most eminent advisers—the proof of all these things unquestionably would have been presented by the letters and documents referred to; and now every one of these is gone.*

* Soon after the death of Mr. Charles D. Marshall, of Buffalo, April 22, 1903, executor of the will of Millard Powers Fillmore, who was supposed to have destroyed all President Fillmore's valuable papers relating to his administration as directed by his son's will, the manuscript letters and documents were discovered uninjured and complete in the garret of Mr. Marshall's house. He had wisely disregarded the mandate to burn the valuable records which are now deposited among the archives of the Buffalo Historical Society, and it is believed a portion of them will be published at no very distant day. It may be added that the correspondence consisting of 8436 letters received by Mr. Fillmore as vice-president and president from March 4, 1849, to March 4, 1853, include many from Daniel Webster, Edward Everett and other of the most distinguished Americans of that period.

The writer of the accompanying letter when a citizen of Buffalo

Among the chief magistrates of our country there appear more brilliant names than Fillmore's, yet none who more wisely led on the nation to progress and prosperity, making her name great and preserving peace in most perilous times, without invoking the power of the sword, or one who could more truthfully say, "These hands are clean." Without being a genius like Webster or Hamilton, he was a safe and sagacious statesman. He possessed a mind so nicely adjusted and well balanced that he was fitted for the fulfilment of any duty which he was called to perform. He was always ready to give up everything but conviction when once convinced. A single public act honestly and unflinchingly performed cost him his popularity. Posterity, looking from a distance, will perhaps be

and before he became president was the younger Fillmore's most intimate friend:

816 Madison Avenue [New York], February 3, 1891.

MY DEAR SIR: Powers Fillmore was a man of the kindest impulses and disposition, but very odd in many ways. I do not know of anybody with whom he was at all confidential regarding personal or family affairs. It was plain to see that he loved his father and fondly cherished his memory though even that could not be gathered from any frequent communication he indulged in concerning him. But he was exceedingly shy, and, above all things, seemed to desire to avoid notice or publicity. You may not see that anything I have written accounts for his conduct in relation to his father's papers, but, knowing him as I did, I can imagine a connection.

And still I am bound to say that he has acted strangely in the matter.

Yours truly,

GROVER CLEVELAND,

Gen. Jas. Grant Wilson.

more just. All his acts, whether daily and common or deliberate and well considered, were marked with modesty, justice, and sincerity. What Speaker Onslow said of Sir Robert Walpole was equally true of President Fillmore: "He was the best man from the goodness of his heart, to live with and under, of any great man I ever knew." His was an eminently kindly nature, and the last time the writer saw him, in 1873, he was relieving, with a liberal hand, the necessities of an old and unfortunate friend. He was a sound, practical Christian "without knowing it," as Pope remarked of a contemporary. His temper was perfect, and it is doubtful if he left an enemy on earth. Frederick the Great announced with energy that "Peter the First of Russia, to govern his nation, worked upon it like aquafortis upon iron." Fillmore, to win his way, like Lincoln and Garfield, from almost hopeless poverty to one of the most eminent positions of the world, showed equal determination, oftentimes working, for weeks and months together, till long past midnight, which happily his powers of physical endurance permitted him to do with impunity, and affording a fine illustration of the proud boast of our country, that its loftiest honors are the legitimate objects of ambition to the humblest in the land, as well as to those favored by the gifts of fortune and high birth. See Chamberlain's "Biography of Millard Fillmore" (Buffalo, 1856);

174 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

Benton's "Abridgment of the Debates of Congress from 1789 to 1856," vol. xvi. (New York, 1861); Thompson's "The Presidents and their Administrations" (Indianapolis, 1873); Address before the Buffalo Historical Society, by James Grant Wilson (Buffalo, 1878); Von Holst's "Constitutional and Political History of the United States," vol. iv. (Chicago, 1885), and "Millard Fillmore Papers," edited by Frank H. Severance, 2 vols., Buffalo Historical Society, 1907.

FRANKLIN PIERCE

BY


BAINBRIDGE WADLEIGH

FRANKLIN PIERCE

FRANKLIN PIERCE, fourteenth president of the United States, born in Hillsborough, N. H., November 23, 1804; died in Concord, N. H., October 8, 1869. His father, Benjamin Pierce (born in Chelmsford, Mass., December 25, 1757; died in Hillsborough, N. H., April 1, 1839), on the day of the battle of Lexington enlisted in the patriot army and served until its disbandment in 1784, attaining the rank of captain and brevet major. He had intense political convictions, was a Republican of the school of Jefferson, an ardent admirer of Jackson, and the leader of his party in New Hampshire, of which he was elected governor in 1827 and 1829. He was a farmer, and trained his children in his own simple and laborious habits. Discerning signs of future distinction in his son Franklin, he gave him an academical education in well-known institutions at Hancock, Frankestown, and Exeter, and in 1820 sent him to Bowdoin college, Brunswick, Me. His college-mates there were John P. Hale, his future political rival, Prof. Calvin E. Stowe, Sargent S. Prentiss, the distinguished orator, Henry W. Longfellow, and Nathaniel Hawthorne, his future biographer and lifelong personal friend. His ambition was then of a

martial cast, and as an officer in a company of college students, he enthusiastically devoted himself to the study of military tactics. This is one reason why he found himself at the foot of his class at the end of two years in college. Stung by a sense of disgrace, he devoted the two remaining years to hard study, and when he was graduated in 1824 he was third in his class. While in college, like many other eminent Americans, he taught in winter. After taking his degree he began the study of law at Portsmouth, in the office of Levi Woodbury, where he remained about a year. He afterward spent two years in the law-school at Northampton, Mass., and in the office of Judge Edmund Parker at Amherst, N. H. In 1827 he was admitted to the bar and began practice in his native town. Soon afterward he argued his first jury cause in the court-house at Amherst. This effort (as is often the case with eminent orators) was a failure. But he was not despondent. He replied to the sympathetic expressions of a friend: "I will try nine hundred and ninety-nine cases, if clients continue to trust me, and if I fail just as I have to-day, I will try the thousandth. I shall live to argue cases in this court-house in a manner that will mortify neither myself nor my friends."

With his popular qualities it was inevitable that he should take a prominent part in the sharp political contests of his native state. He espoused the



Franklin Pierce

From a painting by G. P. A. Healy, in the Corcoran Gallery, Washington, D. C.

cause of Gen. Jackson with ardor, and in 1829 was elected to represent his native town in the legislature, where, by three subsequent elections, he served four years, the last two as speaker, for which office he received three fourths of all the votes of the house. In 1833 he was elected to represent his native district in the lower house of congress, where he remained four years.) He served on the judiciary and other important committees, but did not participate largely in the debates. That could not be expected of so young a man in a body containing so many veteran politicians and statesmen who had already acquired a national reputation. But in February, 1834, he made a vigorous and sensible speech against the Revolutionary claims bill, condemning it as opening the door to fraud. In December, 1835, he spoke and voted against receiving petitions for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. (In June, 1836, he spoke against a bill making appropriations for the military academy at West Point. He contended that that institution was aristocratic in its tendencies, that a professional soldiery and standing armies are always dangerous to the liberties of the people, and that in war the republic must rely upon her citizen militia. His experience in the Mexican war afterward convinced him that such an institution is necessary, and he frankly acknowledged his error. It is hardly necessary to add that while in congress


Mr. Pierce sustained President Jackson in opposing the so-called internal improvement policy. In 1837 he was elected to the U. S. senate. He was the youngest member of that body, and had barely arrived at the legal age for that office when he took his seat. In January, 1840, he spoke upon the Indian war in Florida, defending the secretary of war from the attacks of his political opponents. In December of the same year he advocated and carried through the senate a bill granting a pension to an aged woman whose husband, Isaac Davis, had been among the first to fall at Concord bridge on April 19, 1775. In July, 1841, he spoke against the fiscal bank bill, and in favor of an amendment prohibiting members of congress from borrowing money of the bank. At the same session he made a strong speech against the removal of government officials for their political opinions, in violation of the pledges to the contrary which the Whig leaders had given to the country in the canvass of 1840. During the five years that he remained in the senate it numbered among its members Benton, Buchanan, Clay, Calhoun, Webster, Woodbury, and Silas Wright, an array of veteran statesmen and intellectual giants who had long been party leaders, and who occupied the whole field of debate. Among such men the young, modest, and comparatively obscure member from New Hampshire could not, with what his biographer calls "his exquisite

sense of propriety," force himself into a conspicuous position. There is abundant proof, however, that he won the friendship of his eminent associates.

In 1842 he resigned his seat in the senate, with the intention of permanently withdrawing from public life. He again returned to the practice of law, settling in Concord, N. H., whither he had removed his family in 1838, and where he ever afterward resided. In 1845 he was tendered by the governor of New Hampshire, but declined, an appointment to the U. S. senate to fill the vacancy occasioned by the appointment of Levi Woodbury to the U. S. supreme bench. He also declined the nomination for governor tendered to him by the Democratic state convention. He declined, too, an appointment to the office of U. S. attorney-general, offered to him in 1845 by President Polk, by a letter in which he said that when he left the senate he did so "with the fixed purpose never again to be voluntarily separated from his family for any considerable time, except at the call of his country in time of war." But, while thus evincing his determination to remain in private life, he did not lose his interest in political affairs. In the councils of his party in New Hampshire he exercised a very great influence. He zealously advocated the annexation of Texas, declaring that, while he preferred it free, he would take it with slavery rather

than not have it at all. When John P. Hale, in 1845, accepted a Democratic renomination to congress, in a letter denouncing annexation, the Democratic leaders called another convention, which repudiated him and nominated another candidate. Through the long struggle that followed, Pierce led the Democrats of his state with great skill and unflinching courage, though not always to success. He found in Hale a rival worthy of his steel. A debate between the two champions, in the old North church at Concord, aroused the keenest interest throughout the state. Each party was satisfied with its own advocate; but to contend against the rising anti-slavery sentiment of the north was a hopeless struggle. The stars in their courses fought against slavery. Hale was elected to the U. S. senate in 1846 by a coalition of Whigs and Freesoilers, and several advocates of free-soil principles were elected to congress from New Hampshire before 1850.

In 1846 the war with Mexico began, and New Hampshire was called on for a battalion of troops. Pierce's military ardor was rekindled. He immediately enrolled himself as a private in a volunteer company that was organized at Concord, enthusiastically began studying tactics and drilling in the ranks, and was soon appointed colonel of the 9th regiment of infantry. On March 3, 1847, he received from President Polk the commission of



BIRTHPLACE OF FRANKLIN PIERCE, HILLSBOROUGH, N. H.

brigadier-general in the volunteer army.) On May 27, 1847, he embarked at Newport, R. I., in the bark "Kepler," with Col. Ransom, three companies of the 9th regiment of infantry, and the officers of that detachment, arriving at Vera Cruz on June 28. Much difficulty was experienced in procuring mules for transportation, and the brigade was detained in that unhealthful locality, exposed to the ravages of yellow fever, until July 14, when it began its march to join the main army under Gen. Winfield Scott at Puebla. The junction was effected (after a toilsome march and several encounters with guerillas) on August 6, and the next day Gen. Scott began his advance on the city of Mexico. On August 19 the battle of Contreras was fought. The Mexican General Valencia, with 7,000 troops, occupied a strongly intrenched camp. Gen. Scott's plan was to divert the attention of the enemy by a feigned attack on his front, while his flank could be turned and his retreat cut off. But the flanking movement being much delayed, the attack in front (in which Gen. Pierce led his brigade) became a desperate struggle, in which 4,000 raw recruits, who could not use their artillery, fought 7,000 disciplined soldiers, strongly intrenched and raining round shot and shells upon their assailants. To reach the enemy, the Americans who attacked in front were obliged to cross the pedregal, or lava-bed, the crater of an extinct

volcano, bristling with sharp, jagged, splintered rocks, which afforded shelter to the Mexican skirmishers. Gen. Pierce's horse stepped into a cleft between two rocks and fell, breaking his own leg and throwing his rider, whose knee was seriously injured. Though suffering severely, and urged by the surgeon to withdraw, Gen. Pierce refused to leave his troops. Mounting the horse of an officer who had just been mortally wounded, he rode forward and remained in the saddle until eleven o'clock at night.

The next morning Gen. Pierce was in the saddle at daylight, but the enemy's camp was stormed in the rear by the flanking party, and those of its defenders who escaped death or capture fled in confusion toward Churubusco, where Santa Anna had concentrated his forces. Though Gen. Pierce's injuries were intensely painful, and though Gen. Scott advised him to leave the field, he insisted on remaining. His brigade and that of Gen. James Shields, in obeying an order to make a *détour* and attack the enemy in the rear, struck the Mexican reserves, by whom they were largely outnumbered, and a bloody and obstinate struggle followed. By this diversion Gens. Worth and Pillow were enabled to carry the head of the brigade at the front, and relieve Pierce and Shields from the pressure of overwhelming numbers. In the advance of Pierce's brigade his horse was unable to cross a ditch or

ravine, and he was compelled to dismount and proceed on foot. Overcome by the pain of his injured knee, he sank to the ground, unable to proceed, but refused to be taken from the field, and remained under fire until the enemy were routed. After these defeats, Santa-Anna, to gain time, opened negotiations for peace, and Gen. Scott appointed Gen. Pierce one of the commissioners to agree upon terms of armistice. The truce lasted a fortnight, when Gen. Scott, discovering Santa-Anna's insincerity, again began hostilities. The sanguinary battles of Molino del Rey and Chapultepec soon followed, on September 14, 1847, the city of Mexico capitulated, and the war was virtually over. Though Gen. Pierce had little opportunity to distinguish himself as a general in this brief war, he displayed a personal bravery and a regard for the welfare of his men that won him the highest credit. He also gained the ardent friendship of those with whom he came in contact, and that friendship did much for his future elevation. On the return of peace in December, 1847, Gen. Pierce returned to his home and to the practice of his profession. Soon after this the New Hampshire legislature presented him, in behalf of the state, with a fine sword.

(In 1850 Gen. Pierce was elected to represent the city of Concord in a constitutional convention, and when that body met he was chosen its president by

a nearly unanimous vote. During its session he made strenuous and successful efforts to procure the adoption of an amendment abolishing the religious test that made none but Protestants eligible to office. But that amendment failed of adoption by the people, though practically and by common consent the restriction was disregarded. From 1847 till 1852 Gen. Pierce was arduously engaged in his profession. As an advocate he was never surpassed, if ever equalled, at the New Hampshire bar. He had the external advantages of an orator, a handsome, expressive face, an elegant figure, graceful and impressive gesticulation, and a clear, musical voice, which kindled the blood of his hearers like the notes of a trumpet, or melted them to tears by its pathos. His manner had a courtesy that sprang from the kindness of his heart and contributed much to his political and professional success. His perceptions were keen, and his mind seized at once the vital points of a case, while his ready command of language enabled him to present them to an audience so clearly that they could not be misunderstood. He had an intuitive knowledge of human nature, and the numerous illustrations that he drew from the daily lives of his strong-minded auditors made his speeches doubly effective. He was not a diligent student, nor a reader of many books, yet the keenness of his intellect and his natural capacity for reasoning often enabled

him, with but little preparation, to argue successfully intricate questions of law.

The masses of the Democratic party in the free states so strongly favored the exclusion of slavery from the territory ceded by Mexico that their leaders were compelled to yield, and from 1847 till 1850 their resolutions and platforms advocated free-soil principles. This was especially the case in New Hampshire, and even Gen. Pierce's great popularity could not stem the tide. But in 1850 the passage of the so-called "compromise measures" by congress, the chief of which were the fugitive-slave law and the admission of California as a free state, raised a new issue. Adherence to those measures became to a great extent a test of party fidelity in both the Whig and Democratic parties. Gen. Pierce zealously championed them in New Hampshire, and at a dinner given to him and other personal friends by Daniel Webster at his farmhouse in Franklin, N. H., Pierce, in an eloquent speech, assured the great Whig statesman that if his own party rejected him for his 7th of March speech, the Democracy would "lift him so high that his feet would not touch the stars." Finally the masses of both the great parties gave to the compromise measures a sullen acquiescence, on the ground that they were a final settlement of the slavery question. (The Democratic national convention met at Baltimore, June 12, 1852. After

thirty-five ballotings for a candidate for president, in which Gen. Pierce's name did not appear, the Virginia delegation brought it forward, and on the 49th ballot he was nominated by 282 votes to 11 for all others. James Buchanan, Stephen A. Douglas, Lewis Cass, and William L. Marcy were his chief rivals. Gen. Winfield Scott, the Whig candidate, was unsatisfactory both to the north and to the south. Webster and his friends leaned toward Pierce, and, in the election in November, Scott carried only Massachusetts, Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee, with 42 votes, while Pierce carried all the other states with 254 votes. The Whig party had received its death-stroke, and dissolved.

In his inaugural address, March 4, 1853, President Pierce maintained the constitutionality of slavery and the fugitive-slave law, denounced slavery agitation, and hoped that "no sectional or ambitious or fanatical excitement might again threaten the durability of our institutions, or obscure the light of our prosperity." On March 7 he announced as his cabinet William L. Marcy, of New York, secretary of state; James Guthrie, of Kentucky, secretary of the treasury; Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, secretary of war; James C. Dobbin, of North Carolina, secretary of the navy; Robert McClelland, of Michigan, secretary of the interior; James Campbell, of Pennsylvania, post-

My dear Sir -

I think the
facts stated in the
case of the Consul at
Cape Town ~~show that~~
~~the~~ call for a change.

Will you send me
a commission for Mrs
Hudson.

Yr friend

Franklin Pierce

Yr May - { May 23, 1855
S. O. A. }
S. O. A.

master-general; and Caleb Cushing, of Massachusetts, attorney-general. This cabinet was one of eminent ability, and is the only one in our history that remained unchanged for four years. In 1853 a boundary dispute arose between the United States and Mexico, which was settled by negotiation and resulted in the acquisition of a part of the territory, which was organized under the name of Arizona in 1863. Proposed routes for a railroad to the Pacific were explored and voluminous reports thereon published under the direction of the war department. A controversy with Great Britain respecting the fisheries was adjusted by mutual concessions. The affair of Martin Koszta, a Hungarian refugee, who was seized at Smyrna by an Austrian vessel and given up on the demand of the captain of an American ship-of-war, excited great interest in Europe and redounded to the credit of our government.

In 1854 a treaty was negotiated at Washington between the United States and Great Britain providing for commercial reciprocity for ten years between the former country and the Canadian provinces. That treaty and one negotiated by Com. Matthew C. Perry with Japan, which opened the ports of that hitherto unknown country to commerce, were ratified at the same session of the senate. In the spring of 1854, Greytown in Nicaragua was bombarded and mostly burned by

the U. S. frigate "Cyane," in retaliation for the refusal of the authorities to make reparation for the property of American citizens residing there, which had been stolen. In the following year William Walker, with a party of filibusters, invaded Nicaragua, and in the autumn of 1856 won an ephemeral success, which induced President Pierce to recognize the minister sent by him to Washington. In the winter of 1854-'5, and in the spring of the latter year, by the sanction of Mr. Crampton, the British minister at Washington, recruits for the British army in the Crimea were secretly enlisted in this country. President Pierce demanded Mr. Crampton's recall, which being refused, the president dismissed not only the minister, but also the British consuls at New York, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati, for their complicity in such enlistments. The difficulty was finally adjusted by negotiation, and a new British legation was sent to Washington. In 1855 President Pierce signed bills to reorganize the diplomatic and consular system of the United States, to organize the court of claims, to provide a retired list for the navy, and to confer the title of lieutenant-general on Winfield Scott. President Pierce adhered to that strict construction of the constitution which Jefferson and Jackson had insisted on. In 1854 he vetoed a bill making appropriations for public works, and another granting 10,000,000 acres of

public lands to the state for relief of indigent insane. In February, 1855, he vetoed a bill for payment of the French spoliation claims, and in the following month another increasing the appropriation for the Edward K. Collins line of Atlantic steamers.

The policy of Pierce's administration upon the question of slavery evoked an extraordinary amount of popular excitement, and led to tremendous and lasting results. That policy was based on the theory that the institution of slavery was imbedded in and guaranteed by the constitution of the United States, and that therefore it was the duty of the National government to protect it. The two chief measures in support of such a policy, which originated with and were supported by Pierce's administration, were the conference of American diplomatists that promulgated the "Ostend manifesto," and opening of the territories of Kansas and Nebraska to slavery. Filibustering expeditions from the United States to Cuba under Lopez, in 1850 and 1851, aroused anxiety in Europe as to the attitude of our government toward such enterprises. In 1852 Great Britain and France proposed to the United States a tripartite treaty by which the three powers should disclaim all intention of acquiring Cuba, and discountenance such an attempt by any power. On December 1, 1852, Edward Everett, who was then secretary of

state, declined to act, declaring, however, that our government would never question Spain's title to the island. On August 16, 1854, President Pierce directed James Buchanan, John Y. Mason, and Pierre Soule, the American ministers to Great Britain, France, and Spain, to meet and discuss the Cuban question. They met at Ostend, October 9, and afterward at Aix la Chapelle, and sent to their government that famous despatch known as the "Ostend manifesto." It declared that, if Spain should obstinately refuse to sell Cuba, self-preservation would make it incumbent on the United States to wrest it from her and prevent it from being Africanized into a second Santo Domingo. But the hostile attitude of the great European powers, and the Kansas and Nebraska excitement, shelved the Cuban question till 1858, when a feeble and abortive attempt was made in congress to authorize its purchase for \$30,000,000.

President Pierce, in his first message to congress, December, 1853, spoke of the repose that had followed the compromises of 1850, and said: "That this repose is to suffer no shock during my official term if I have power to prevent it, those who placed me here may be assured." Doubtless such was then his hope and belief. In the following January, Mr. Douglas, chairman of the senate committee on the territories, introduced a bill to organize the territories of Kansas and Nebraska, which per-

mitted slavery north of the parallel of $36^{\circ} 30'$ in a region from which it had been forever excluded by the Missouri compromise of 1820. That bill was Mr. Douglas's bid for the presidency. Southern politicians could not reject it and retain their influence at home. Northern politicians who opposed it gave up all hope of national preferment, which then seemed to depend on southern support. The defeat of the bill seemed likely to sever and destroy the Democratic organization, a result which many believed would lead to civil war and the dissolution of the Union. Borne onward by the aggressive spirit of slavery, by political ambition, by the force of party discipline, and the dread of sectional discord, the bill was passed by congress, and on May 31 received the signature of the president. Slavery had won, but there never was a more costly victory. The remainder of Pierce's term was embittered by civil war in Kansas and the disasters of his party in the free states. In 1854, with a Democratic majority in both houses of the New Hampshire legislature, the influence of the national administration could not secure the election of a Democratic U. S. senator, and at the next election in 1855 the Democracy lost control of the state.

The repeal of the Missouri compromise was soon followed by organized efforts in the free states to fill Kansas with anti-slavery settlers. To

such movements the south responded by armed invasions. On March 30, 1855, a territorial legislature was elected in Kansas by armed bands from Missouri, who crossed the border to vote and then returned to their homes. That initiative gave to the pro-slavery men a technical advantage, which the Democratic leaders were swift to recognize. The pro-slavery legislature thus elected met at Pawnee on July 2, 1855, and enacted an intolerant and oppressive slave code, which was mainly a transcript of the laws of Missouri. The free-state settlers thereupon called a constitutional convention, which met on October 23, 1855, and framed a state constitution, which was adopted by the people by a vote of 1,731 to 46. A general assembly was then elected under such constitution, which, after passing some preliminary acts, appointed a committee to frame a code of laws, and took measures to apply to congress for the admission of Kansas into the Union as a state. Andrew H. Reeder was elected by the free-state men their delegate to congress. A majority of the actual settlers of Kansas were in favor of her admission into the Union as a free state; but all their efforts to that end were treated by their opponents in the territory, and by the Democratic national administration, as rebellion against lawful authority. This conflict kept the territory in a state of confusion and bloodshed, and excited party feeling through-

out the country to fever heat. It remained unsettled, to vex Buchanan's administration and further develop the germs of disunion and sanguinary civil war.

On June 2, 1856, the National Democratic convention met at Cincinnati to nominate a candidate for president. On the first ballot James Buchanan had 135 votes, Pierce 122, Douglas 33, Cass 6. Pierce's vote gradually diminished, and on the 17th ballot Buchanan was nominated unanimously. In August the house of representatives attached to the army appropriation bill a proviso that no part of the army should be employed to enforce the laws of the Kansas territorial legislature until congress should have declared its validity. The senate refused to concur, and congress adjourned without passing the bill. It was immediately convened by proclamation, and passed the bill without the proviso. The president's message in December following was mainly devoted to Kansas affairs, and was intensely hostile to the free-state party. His term ended on March 4, 1857, and he returned to his home in Concord. Soon afterward he visited Madeira, and extended his travels to Great Britain and the continent of Europe. He remained abroad nearly three years, returning to Concord early in 1860. In the presidential election of that year he took no active part, but his influence was cast

against Stephen A. Douglas and in favor of John C. Breckinridge.

In a letter addressed to Jefferson Davis, under date of January 6, 1860, he wrote: "Without discussing the question of right, of abstract power to secede, I have never believed that actual disruption of the Union can occur without bloodshed; and if, through the madness of northern Abolitionists, that dire calamity must come, the fighting will not be along Mason and Dixon's line merely. It will be within our own borders, in our own streets, between the two classes of citizens to whom I have referred. Those who defy law and scout constitutional obligations will, if we ever reach the arbitrament of arms, find occupation enough at home. . . . I have tried to impress upon our own people, especially in New Hampshire and Connecticut, where the only elections are to take place during the coming spring, that, while our Union meetings are all in the right direction and well enough for the present, they will not be worth the paper upon which their resolutions are written unless we can overthrow abolitionism at the polls and repeal the unconstitutional and obnoxious laws which in the cause of 'personal liberty' have been placed upon our statute-books." On April 21, 1861, nine days after the disunionists had begun civil war by firing on Fort Sumter, he addressed a Union mass-meeting at Concord, and urged the people to sustain the

government against the southern Confederacy. From that time until his death he lived in retirement at Concord. To the last he retained his hold upon the hearts of his personal friends, and the exquisite urbanity of his earlier days. His wife and his three children had preceded him to the tomb.

Some years after Pierce's death the legislature of New Hampshire, in behalf of the state, placed his portrait beside the speaker's desk in the hall of the house of representatives at Concord. Time has softened the harsh judgment that his political foes passed upon him in the heat of party strife and civil war. His generosity and kindness of heart are gratefully remembered by those who knew him, and particularly by the younger members of his profession, whom he was always ready to aid and advise. It is remembered that in his professional career he was ever willing, at whatever risk to his fortune or popularity, to shield the poor and obscure from oppression and injustice. It is remembered, too, that he sought in public life no opportunities for personal gain. His integrity was above suspicion. After nine years' service in congress and in the senate of the United States, after a brilliant and successful professional career and four years in the presidency, his estate hardly amounted to \$72,000. In his whole political career he always stood for a strict construction of the con-

stitution, for economy and frugality in public affairs, and for a strict accountability of public officials to their constituents. No political or personal influence could induce him to shield those whom he believed to have defrauded the government. Pierce had ambition, but greed for public office was foreign to his nature. Few, if any, instances can be found in our history where a man of thirty-eight, in the full vigor of health, voluntarily gave up a seat in the U. S. senate, which he was apparently sure to retain as long as he wished. His refusal at the age of forty-one to leave his law-practice for the place of attorney-general in Polk's cabinet is almost without a parallel.

Franklin Pierce, too, was a true patriot and a sincere lover of his country. The Revolutionary services of a father whom he revered were constantly in his thoughts. Two of his brothers, with that father's consent, took an honorable part in the war of 1812. His only sister was the wife of Gen. John H. McNeil, as gallant an officer as ever fought for his country. To decline a cabinet appointment and enlist as a private soldier in the army of his country were acts which one who knew his early training and his chivalrous character might reasonably expect of him. But for slavery and the questions growing out of it, his administration would have passed into history as one of the most successful in our national life. To judge him

justly, his political training and the circumstances that environed him must be taken into account. Like his honored father, he believed that the statesmen of the Revolution had agreed to maintain the legal rights of the slave-holders, and that without such agreement we should have had no Federal constitution or Union. He believed that good faith required that agreement to be performed. In that belief all or nearly all the leaders of both the great parties concurred. However divided on other questions, on that the south was a unit. The price of its political support was compliance with its demands, and both the old parties (however reluctantly) paid the price. Political leaders believed that, unless it was paid, civil war and disunion would result, and their patriotism re-enforced their party spirit and personal ambition. Among them all there were probably few whose conduct would have been essentially different from that of Pierce had they been in the same situation. He gave his support to the repeal of the Missouri compromise with great reluctance, and in the belief that the measure would satisfy the south and thus avert from the country the doom of civil war and disunion. See the lives by Nathaniel Hawthorne (Boston, 1852) and David W. Bartlett (Auburn, 1852), and "Review of Pierce's Administration," by Arthur E. Carroll (Boston, 1856).

200 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

HIS wife, JANE MEANS APPLETON, born in Hampton, N. H., March 12, 1806; died in Andover, Mass., December 2, 1863, was a daughter of the Rev. Jesse Appleton, D.D., president of Bowdoin college. She was brought up in an atmosphere of cultivated and refined Christian influences, was thoroughly educated, and grew to womanhood surrounded by most congenial circumstances. She was married in 1834. Public observation was extremely painful to her, and she always preferred the quiet of her New England home to the glare and glitter of fashionable life in Washington. A friend said of her: "How well she filled her station as wife, mother, daughter, sister, and friend, those only can tell who knew her in these private relations. In this quiet sphere she found her joy, and here her gentle but powerful influence was deeply and constantly felt, through wise counsels and delicate suggestions, the purest, finest tastes, and a devoted life." She was the mother of three children, all boys, but none survived her. Two died in early youth, and the youngest, Benjamin, was killed in an accident on the Boston and Maine railroad while travelling from Andover to Lawrence, Mass., on January 6, 1853, only two months before his father's inauguration as president. Mr. and Mrs. Pierce were with him at the time, and the boy, a bright lad of thirteen years, had been amusing them with his con-

versation just before the accident. The car was thrown from the track and dashed against the rocks, and the lad met his death instantly. Both parents were long deeply affected by the shock of the accident, and Mrs. Pierce never recovered from it. The sudden bereavement shattered the small remnant of her remaining health, yet she performed her task at the White House nobly, and sustained the dignity of her husband's office. Mrs. Robert E. Lee wrote in a private letter: "I have known many of the ladies of the White House, none more truly excellent than the afflicted wife of President Pierce. Her health was a bar to any great effort on her part to meet the expectations of the public in her high position, but she was a refined, extremely religious, and well-educated lady." She was buried by the side of her three children, in the cemetery at Concord, New Hampshire.

JAMES BUCHANAN

BY

GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS

JAMES BUCHANAN

JAMES BUCHANAN, fifteenth president of the United States, born near Mercersburg, Pa., April 23, 1791; died in Lancaster, Pa., June 1, 1868. The days of his youth were those of the nation's youth; his public career of forty years saw all our great extensions of boundary on the south and west, acquired from foreign powers, the admission of thirteen new states, the development of many important questions of internal and foreign policy, and the gradual rise and final culmination of a great and disastrous insurrection. He was educated at a school in Mercersburg and at Dickinson college, Pa., where he was graduated in 1809. He began to practise law in Lancaster in 1812. His early political principles were those of the federalists, who disapproved of the war; yet, as he himself said, "he thought it was the duty of every patriot to defend the country, while the war was raging, against a foreign enemy." His first public address was made at the age of twenty-three, on the occasion of a popular meeting in Lancaster after the capture of Washington by the British in 1814. He urged the enlistment of volunteers for

the defence of Baltimore, and was among the first to enroll his name. In October of the same year he was elected to the house of representatives in the legislature of Pennsylvania for Lancaster County.

Peace was proclaimed early in 1815, and on July 4 Mr. Buchanan delivered an oration before the Washington association of Lancaster. In it he spoke of the war as "glorious, in the highest degree, to the American character, but disgraceful in the extreme to the administration." The speech excited much criticism, and in later life he said that "it contained many sentiments which he regretted, but that at the same time it could not be denied that the country was wholly unprepared for war at the period of its declaration, and the attempt to carry it on by means of loans, without any resort to taxation, had well nigh made the government bankrupt." He was again elected to the legislature in October, 1815, and at the close of that session he retired to the practice of his profession, in which he gained early distinction, especially in the impeachment of a judge, whom he successfully defended. His intention at this time was not to re-enter public life, but the death of a young lady to whom he was engaged caused him to seek change and distraction of thought, and he accepted a nomination to congress, and was elected in 1820 for a district composed of the counties of Lancaster,



James Buchanan

From a photograph by Brady, Washington, D. C.

York, and Dauphin, taking his seat in December, 1821. He was called a federalist, but the party distinctions of that time were not very clearly defined, and Mr. Buchanan's political principles, as a national statesman, were yet to be formed. Mr. Monroe had become president in 1817, and held that office during two terms, his administration being called "the era of good feeling." The excitement and animosities of the war of 1812 had subsided, and when Mr. Buchanan entered congress there was no sectionalism to disturb the repose of the country. Questions of internal policy soon arose, however, and he took an able part in many important debates. Mr. Monroe's veto of a bill imposing tolls for the support of the Cumberland road, for which Mr. Buchanan had voted, produced a strong effect upon the latter's constitutional views. It was the first time that his mind had been brought sharply to the consideration of the question in what mode "internal improvements" can be effected by the general government, and consequently he began to perceive the dividing line between the federal and the state powers.

Mr. Buchanan remained in the house of representatives ten years—during Mr. Monroe's second term, through the administration of John Quincy Adams, and during the first two years of Jackson's administration. In December, 1829, he became chairman of the judiciary committee of the house,

and as such introduced a bill to amend and extend the judicial system of the United States, by including in the circuit-court system six new states, and by increasing the number of judges of the supreme court to nine. His speech in explanation of this measure—which was not adopted at the time—was as important as any that has been made upon the subject. Another measure, evincing a thorough knowledge and very accurate views of the nature of our mixed system of governments, was a minority report, presented by him as chairman of this committee, against a proposition to repeal the 25th section of the Judiciary act of 1789, which gave the supreme court appellate jurisdiction, by writ of error to the state courts, in cases where the constitution, treaties, and laws of the United States are drawn in question. This report caused the rejection of the bill by a vote of 138 to 51. During Mr. Adams's term the friends of the administration began to take the name of national republicans, while the opposing party assumed the name of democrats. Mr. Buchanan was one of the leaders of the opposition in the house of representatives. He was always a strong supporter and warm personal friend of Gen. Jackson.

At the close of the 21st congress in March, 1831, it was Buchanan's wish to retire from public life, but, at the request of Gen. Jackson (who had become president in 1829), he accepted the mission

to Russia. He embarked from New York in a sailing-vessel on April 8, 1832, and arrived at St. Petersburg about the middle of June. The chief objects of his mission were the negotiation of a commercial treaty that should promote an increase of the commerce between Russia and the United States by regulating the duties to be levied on the merchandise of each country by the other so far as to prevent undue discrimination in favor of the products of other countries; to provide for the residence and functions of consuls, etc.; and also the negotiation of a treaty respecting the maritime rights of neutral nations on the principle that "free ships make free goods." The Russian minister for foreign affairs at this time was Count Nesselrode. He favored the treaty of commerce, and, though there was much opposition to it from some members of the Russian ministry, it was finally concluded on December 18, 1832. The negotiation concerning a treaty on maritime rights was not successful, because, as Mr. Buchanan wrote, "Russia is endeavoring to manage England at present, and this is an unpropitious moment to urge her to adopt principles of public law which would give offence to that nation, and which would in any way abridge her own belligerent rights." His attractive manners and evident sincerity of character produced their effect on the Russians, especially the emperor and empress; and he wrote home: "I flatter myself

that a favorable change has been effected in his [the emperor's] feelings toward the United States since my arrival"; and at his audience of leave the emperor told him to tell Gen. Jackson to send him another minister exactly like himself. He wrote to President Jackson: "Your foreign policy has had no small influence on public opinion throughout Europe." Of Russia and the emperor Mr. Buchanan wrote: "There is no freedom of the press, no public opinion, and but little political conversation, and that very much guarded; in short, we live in the calm of despotism, though the Emperor Nicholas [I.] is one of the best of despots. Coming abroad can teach an American no other lesson but to love his country, its institutions, and its laws better, much better than he did before. I have not yet learned to submit patiently to the drudgery of etiquette. Foreign ministers must drive a carriage and four with a postilion."

He left St. Petersburg on August 8, 1833, spent a short time in Paris and London, and reached home in November. The next year was spent in private occupations in Lancaster, except that he was one of the commissioners appointed by Pennsylvania to arrange with commissioners from New Jersey concerning the use of the waters of Delaware river. On December 6, 1834, the legislature of Pennsylvania elected him to the U. S. senate to succeed Mr. Wilkins, who had been appointed

minister to Russia. This office was acknowledged by Mr. Buchanan afterward to be "the only public office he desired to occupy." He took his seat December 15. He held very strongly the doctrine of instruction—that is, the right of a state legislature to direct the vote of a senator of the state in congress, and the duty of the senator to obey. There has never been a period in the history of the senate when more real power of debate was displayed, or when public measures were more thoroughly considered, than at this time. President Jackson's celebrated proclamation against nullification, and his removal of the public deposits from the bank of the United States into certain selected state banks, had been made during Mr. Buchanan's residence abroad. Jackson enjoyed great popularity and influence throughout the country, but a large majority of the senate were opposed to his financial measures. This opposing party, the old "national republicans" of John Quincy Adams's administration, were now called whigs, and included Mr. Clay, Mr. Webster, Mr. Clayton, of Delaware, Mr. Ewing, of Ohio, and Mr. Frelinghuysen and Mr. Southard, of New Jersey. Among the Jackson men, or democrats, were Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Wright, of New York, Mr. Benton, of Missouri, and Mr. King, of Alabama. Mr. Calhoun stood apart from both the political parties, a great and powerful debater who had been vice-

president, and who was now senator from the "nullifying" state of South Carolina.

One of the first debates in which Mr. Buchanan took part in the senate (and one that has not yet lost its interest) was upon a bill requiring the president, when making a nomination to fill a vacancy occasioned by the removal of any officer, to state the fact of such removal and to render reasons for it. Mr. Buchanan opposed it. He contended that the constitution only made the consent of the senate necessary in the appointment of officers by the executive, not in their removal, that, if such consent were required, long and dangerous delays might occur when the senate was not in session; and that, if the president must assign reasons for removals, these reasons must be investigated, much time would be consumed, and the legislative branch of the government would thus exercise functions to which it has no claim. Another great discussion into which Mr. Buchanan entered related to the refusal of the legislative chambers of France to pay a certain sum that had been promised in 1831 by a convention between the United States and the government of King Louis Philippe for the liquidation of certain claims of American citizens against France. The United States waited three years in vain for the payment of this money; and finally, in January, 1836, the president recommended to congress a partial non-intercourse with

France. Mr. Buchanan made a long and earnest speech, contending against Webster and Clay, in support of this measure, insisting that "there is a point in the intercourse between nations at which diplomacy must end and a nation must either consent to abandon her rights or assert them by force." There was some danger for a time of war with France, but eventually Great Britain made an offer of mediation and the difficulty was amicably adjusted.

In January, 1837, Mr. Buchanan delivered a speech that may be regarded as his ablest effort in the senate. It was in support of Col. Benton's "expunging" resolution, which proposed to cancel in the journal of the senate Mr. Clay's resolution of censure against President Jackson for his removal of the public deposits from the bank of the United States. In this argument Mr. Buchanan separated, in a remarkable degree, that which was personal and partisan in the controversy from the serious questions involved. He contended that the censure passed by the senate in 1834 upon the president was unjust, because he had violated no law; and that the senate, in recording such a mere censure, adopted in its legislative capacity, had rendered itself incompetent to perform its high judicial function of impeachment. He concluded with a very ingenious and elaborate criticism of the

word "expunge." The "expunging" resolution was adopted by a party vote.

Toward the end of Jackson's administration the subject of slavery began to be pressed upon the attention of congress by petitions for its abolition in the District of Columbia. One memorial on this subject was presented by Mr. Buchanan himself from some Quakers in his own state. Mr. Calhoun and others objected to the reception of these petitions. Mr. Buchanan, though he disapproved of slavery, yet contended that congress had no power under the constitution to interfere with slavery within those states where it existed, and that it would be very unwise to abolish it in the District of Columbia—"a district carved out of two slaveholding states and surrounded by them on all sides"; but, nevertheless, he also contended, in a long and forcible speech, for the people's right of petition and the duty of congress, save under exceptional circumstances, to receive their petitions. In June, 1836, Mr. Buchanan argued, against Mr. Webster, for a bill, introduced in conformity with a special recommendation from President Jackson, prohibiting the circulation through the mails of incendiary publications on the subject of slavery. In a very sarcastic speech against a bill to prevent the interference of certain federal officers with elections, even in conversation, Mr. Buchanan thus expressed his political faith: "I support the president

because he is in favor of a strict and limited construction of the constitution, according to the true spirit of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions. I firmly believe that if this government is to remain powerful and permanent it can only be by never assuming doubtful powers which must necessarily bring it into collision with the states. I oppose the whig party, because, according to their reading of the constitution, congress possesses, and they think ought to exercise, powers which would endanger the rights of the states and the liberties of the people."

The most important and far-reaching of President Jackson's executive measures was his veto in 1832 of a bill for renewing the charter of the bank of the United States. Jackson removed the national deposits into certain state banks, which produced financial distress throughout the land. Mr. Buchanan was conspicuous in the senate as a supporter of Jackson's financial policy throughout his administration and that of his successor, Mr. Van Buren, of the same party. Mr. Buchanan had been re-elected to the senate in January, 1837, by a very large vote and for a full term, his first election having been to a vacancy, and he was the first person that had ever received a second election from the legislature of Pennsylvania. In 1839 Mr. Van Buren offered Mr. Buchanan the attorney-generalship, which Mr. Grundy had resigned. Mr.

Buchanan answered that he "preferred his position as a senator from Pennsylvania; that nothing could induce him to waive this preference except a sense of public duty, and that he felt that he could render a more efficient support to the principles" of the administration "on the floor of the senate than he could in an executive office." The great commercial distress of the country produced, in the elections of 1840, a political revolution, and on March 4, 1841, the whigs came into power under President Harrison. His death in April placed in the executive chair Mr. Tyler, who proved to be opposed to a national bank, and vetoed two bills: the first for a national bank, and the second for a "Fiscal Corporation of the United States." Mr. Clay made frequent attacks upon Mr. Tyler's vetoes, and even proposed a joint resolution for an amendment of the constitution requiring but a bare majority, instead of two thirds, of each house of congress to pass a bill over the president's objections.

Mr. Buchanan, on February 2, 1842, replied to Mr. Clay in a speech that may be ranked very high as an exposition of one of the most important parts of our political system. He showed that the president's veto was the people's safeguard, through the officer who "more nearly represents a majority of the whole people than any other branch of the government," against the encroachments of

the senate. The veto power "owes its existence," said he, "to a revolt of the people of Rome against the tyrannical decrees of the Roman senate. The president of the United States, elected by his fellow-citizens to the highest official trust in the country, is directly responsible to them for the manner in which he shall discharge his duties; and he will not array himself, by the exercise of the veto power, against a majority in both houses of congress, unless in extreme cases, where, from strong convictions of public duty, he may be willing to draw down upon himself their hostility." Mr. Buchanan was one of those that opposed the ratification of the treaty with England negotiated by Mr. Webster and Lord Ashburton in 1842. In 1843 he was elected to the senate for a third term, and in 1844 his name was brought forward as the democratic candidate of Pennsylvania for the presidential nomination; but before the national convention met he withdrew in order that the whole strength of the party might be concentrated upon one candidate. James K. Polk was elected; he asked Mr. Buchanan to become his secretary of state, and the invitation was accepted.

In this responsible position Mr. Buchanan had two very important questions to deal with, and they required the exercise of all his political tact and indefatigable industry. One was the settlement of the boundary between the territory of Oregon and

the British possessions. The other was the annexation of Texas, which resulted in the Mexican war. Texas had been for nine years independent of Mexico, and now sought admission into our union. The difficulties that attended this question were, on the one hand, the danger of increasing the excitement, already considerable, against slavery (for Texas would be a slave-holding state); and, on the other, the danger of interference on the part of England if Texas should remain independent and resume her war with Mexico. The adoption by Texas of the basis of annexation proposed by the United States was followed by the refusal of the Mexican government to receive Mr. Slidell, sent by Mr. Polk as envoy extraordinary, with the object of avoiding a war and to settle all questions between the two countries, including the western boundary of Texas. The result of the Mexican war was the cession to the United States of California and New Mexico and the final settlement of the Texan boundary.

The policy of Mr. Polk's administration toward the states of Central America and on the subject of the Monroe doctrine was shaped by Mr. Buchanan very differently from that adopted by the succeeding administration of Gen. Taylor, whose secretary of state was Mr. Clayton, the American negotiator of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty with Great Britain. Acting under Mr. Buchanan's

advice, President Polk, in his first annual message, in December, 1845, reasserted the Monroe doctrine that no European nation should henceforth be allowed by the United States to plant any colony on the American continent or to interfere in any way in American affairs. This declaration was intended to frustrate the attempts of England to obtain a footing in the then Mexican province of California by an extensive system of colonization. England's aims were defeated for the time. Two years afterward, when the Mexican war was drawing to a close, Mr. Buchanan turned the attention of President Polk to the encroachments of the British government in Central America, under the operation of a protectorate over the kingdom of the Mosquito Indians. Great disturbances followed in Yucatan, and the Indians began a war of extermination against the whites. If not actually incited by the British authorities, the savages were known to be supplied with British muskets. The whites were reduced to such extremities that the authorities of Yucatan offered to transfer the dominion and sovereignty of the peninsula to the United States, as a consideration for defending it against the Indians, at the same time giving notice that if this offer should be declined they would make the same proposition to England and Spain. The president recommended to congress the appeal of Yucatan, but declined to recommend the adoption of any

220 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

measure with a view to acquire the dominion and sovereignty over the peninsula. In April, 1847, the United States appointed a *chargé d'affaires* to Guatemala, and Mr. Buchanan instructed him to "promote, by his counsel and advice, should suitable occasions offer, the reunion of the states that formed the federation of Central America; to cultivate the most friendly relations with Guatemala and the other states of Central America; and to communicate to the state department all the information obtainable concerning the British encroachments upon the Mosquito kingdom."


The new *chargé* was prevented from reaching Guatemala until late in Mr. Polk's administration, and the plan wisely conceived by Mr. Buchanan was not carried out. In the meantime the British government seized upon the port of San Juan de Nicaragua, the only good harbor along the coast. Instead of carrying out the policy of President Polk and Mr. Buchanan, the administration of President Taylor, without consulting the states of Central America, entered in 1850 into the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, the ambiguous language of which soon gave rise to such complications and misunderstandings between England and the United States that Mr. Buchanan was obliged to go, subsequently, as minister to London, to endeavor to unravel them. Instead of a simple provision requiring Great Britain absolutely to recede from

the Mosquito protectorate, and to restore to Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica their respective territories, the treaty declared that neither of the parties should "make use of any protection which either affords or may afford, or any alliance which either has or may have, to or with any state or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any fortifications, or of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising any dominion over the same." It soon became the British construction of this clause that it recognized the existence of the Mosquito protectorate for all purposes other than those expressly prohibited; and down to the time when Mr. Buchanan was sent by President Pierce as minister to England this claim was still maintained.

On the accession of the whig party to power under Taylor, in March, 1849, Mr. Buchanan retired for a time from official life. His home, from the age of eighteen, had been the city of Lancaster, where he owned a house. In the autumn of 1848 he purchased a small estate of twenty-two acres, known as Wheatland, about a mile from the town. The house was a substantial brick mansion, and, on Mr. Buchanan's retirement from the cabinet, this became his permanent abode when he was not occupying an official residence in London or in Washington. Mr. Buchanan never married. The death of the lady whom he had intended to marry

was a deep and lasting sorrow. The loss of his sister, Mrs. Lane, in 1839, and of her husband two years later, gave him the care of their four children; and the youngest of these, afterward widely known as Miss Harriet Lane, became an inmate of his household. James Buchanan Henry, the son of another sister, who died about the same time, was also taken into his family; and these two cousins were brought up by their uncle with the most wise and affectionate care. Mr. Buchanan's letters to his niece, begun when she was a school-girl, and, after Miss Lane had grown up, written almost daily during her absences from him, give a charming picture of his private life.

During the few years of Mr. Buchanan's unofficial life, passed chiefly at Wheatland, he does not appear to have devoted much time to the law. His correspondence was large; and this, with a constant and lively interest in public affairs, rendered him, even in retirement, very busy. He lent considerable influence to his party as a private individual; but his exertions were not marked by purely partisan feeling. He strenuously opposed the Wilmot proviso, which aimed at excluding slavery from all newly acquired territory; and favored Mr. Clay's "Compromise Measures of 1850," which provided for the admission of California as a free state, and the abolition of the slave-trade in the District of Columbia; but, by the



WHEATLAND, NEAR LANCASTER, PA., THE HOME OF JAMES BUCHANAN

fugitive slave law, secured the return to their owners of slaves that had escaped into free states. He wrote many influential public letters, in one of which he declared that "two things are necessary to preserve the union from danger: 1. Agitation in the north on the subject of southern slavery must be rebuked and put down by a strong and enlightened public opinion; 2. The fugitive slave law must be enforced in its spirit."

In the presidential election of 1852 Mr. Buchanan was a candidate for the democratic nomination; but Gen. Franklin Pierce received the nomination and was elected. The most important service rendered by Mr. Buchanan to his party in this election—and with him a service to his party was alike a service to his country—was a speech made at Greensburgh, Pa., in October, 1852, in opposition to the election of Gen. Winfield Scott, the whig candidate. This speech exhibited in a very clear light the whole political history of that period, and asserted a principle which he said ought to be an article of democratic faith: "Beware of elevating to the highest civil trust the commander of your victorious armies," drawing a distinction between one "who had been a man of war, and nothing but a man of war from his youth upward," and such as had been "soldiers only in the day and hour of danger, when the country had demanded their services, and who had already illustrated high

civil appointments"; and then criticising exhaustively each of Gen. Scott's avowed political opinions, and quoting Mr. Thurlow Weed, "one of Gen. Scott's most able supporters," as acknowledging that "there was weakness in all Scott said or did about the presidency."

When, in 1853, Franklin Pierce became president, he appointed Mr. Buchanan minister to England. Buchanan, though social in his nature, was a man of simple republican tastes, and the formality and etiquette of life at a foreign court, never agreeable, now, at the age of sixty-two, appeared to him particularly distasteful; besides, he considered that his duty to his young relatives as well as to his only surviving brother, a clergyman in delicate health, required his presence at home. But with Mr. Buchanan duty to his country always outweighed every other consideration, and Mr. Pierce's urgent appeal to him to accept what was at that time a very important mission at length prevailed. Mr. Buchanan sailed for England from New York on August 5, 1853, and landed in Liverpool on the 17th. There were three important questions to be settled with England at this time: the first related to the fisheries; the second was the desire of England to establish reciprocal free trade in certain enumerated articles between the United States and the British North American provinces, and thus preserve their allegiance and ward off

the danger of their annexation to the United States; and this Mr. Buchanan was very desirous to use as a powerful lever to secure the third point, which the United States earnestly desired, viz., the withdrawal of all British dominion in Central America, and the recognition of the Monroe doctrine, which the Clayton-Bulwer treaty had not firmly established.

President Pierce considered it best that the reciprocity and fishery questions should be settled at Washington; but Mr. Buchanan was intrusted with the negotiation of the Central American question in London. Mr. Buchanan's main object was to develop and ascertain the precise difference between the two governments in regard to the construction of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, but the Crimean war so long delayed the negotiations with this country that nothing could be accomplished while he remained in England. As the war approached and when it was finally declared, the principles of neutrality, privateering, and many other topics came within the range of the discussion; and it was very much in consequence of the views expressed by Mr. Buchanan to Lord Clarendon, and by the latter communicated to the British cabinet, that the course of England toward neutrals during that war became what it was. When Lord Clarendon, in 1854, presented to Mr. Buchanan a *project* for a treaty between Great Britain,

France, and the United States, making it piracy for neutrals to serve on board of privateers cruising against the commerce of either of the three nations when such nation was a belligerent, the very impressive reasons that Mr. Buchanan opposed to it caused it to be abandoned. An American minister at the English court, at periods of exciting and critical questions between the two nations, is very likely to experience a considerable variation in the social barometer. But the strength of Mr. Buchanan's character, and the agreeable personal qualities which were in him united with the gravity of years and an experience of a very uncommon kind, overcame at all times any tendency to social unpleasantness that might have been caused by national feelings excited by temporary causes. Throughout his residence in England Mr. Buchanan was treated with marked attention, not only by society in general, but the queen and the prince consort. Miss Lane joined him in the spring of 1854, and remained with him until the autumn of 1855.

Mr. Buchanan arrived in New York in April, 1856, and there met with a public reception from the authorities and people of the city that evinced the interest that now began to be everywhere manifested in him as the probable future president. Prior to the meeting of the national democratic convention at Cincinnati in June, 1856, there was

lack of organization on the part of Mr. Buchanan's political friends; and Mr. Buchanan himself, though willing to accept the nomination, made no efforts to secure it, and did not believe that he would receive it. The rival claimants were President Pierce and Senator Douglas, of Illinois. Chiefly through the efforts of Mr. Slidell, Mr. Buchanan was nominated. By this time the whig party had disappeared, the old party lines were obliterated, and the main political issue had come to be the question of slavery or no slavery in the territories. The anti-slavery party now called themselves republicans, and their candidate was Gen. Frémont. The result of the election shows, with great distinctness, the following facts: 1. That Mr. Buchanan was chosen president because he received the electoral votes of the five free states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, and California (sixty-two in all), and that without them he could not have been elected. 2. That his southern vote (that of every slave-holding state excepting Maryland) was partly given to him because of his conservative opinions and position, and partly because the candidate for the vice-presidency, Mr. Breckinridge, was a southern man. 3. That Gen. Frémont received the electoral vote of no southern state, and that this was due partly to the character of the republican party, and partly to the fact that the republican candidate for the

vice-presidency, Mr. Dayton, of New Jersey, was a citizen of a non-slave-holding state. Gen. Frémont himself was nominally a citizen of California.

This election, therefore, foreshadowed the sectional division that would be almost certain to happen in the next one if the four years of Mr. Buchanan's administration should not witness a subsidence in the sectional feelings between the north and the south. It would only be necessary for the republicans to wrest from the democratic party the five free states that had voted for Mr. Buchanan, and they would elect the president in 1860. Whether this was to happen would depend upon the ability of the democratic party to avoid a rupture into factions that would themselves be representatives of irreconcilable dogmas on the subject of slavery in the territories. Hence it is that Mr. Buchanan's course as president, for the first three years of his term, is to be judged with reference to the responsibility that was upon him so to conduct the government as to disarm, if possible, the antagonism of section to section. His administration of affairs after the election of Mr. Lincoln is to be judged simply by his duty as the executive in the most extraordinary and anomalous crisis in which the country had ever been placed.

Mr. Buchanan was inaugurated on March 4, 1857. The cabinet, which was confirmed by the senate on March 6, consisted of Lewis Cass, of

Michigan, secretary of state; Howell Cobb, of Georgia, secretary of the treasury; John B. Floyd, of Virginia, secretary of war; Isaac Toucey, of Connecticut, secretary of the navy; Aaron V. Brown, of Tennessee, postmaster-general; Jacob Thompson, of Mississippi, secretary of the interior; and Jeremiah S. Black, of Pennsylvania, attorney-general. The internal affairs of the country during Buchanan's administration occupied so much of the public attention at the time, and have since been a subject of so much interest, that his management of our foreign relations has been quite obscured. The wisdom displayed in this branch of his duties was such as might have been expected from one who had had his previous experience in the state department and in important diplomatic posts. His only equals in the executive office in this respect have been Mr. Jefferson and Mr. John Quincy Adams. During an administration fraught with the most serious hazards to the internal relations of the states with each other, he kept steadily in view the preservation of peace and good will between the United States and Great Britain, while he abated nothing from our just claims or our national dignity. He left to his successor no unsettled question between these two nations that was of any immediate importance, and he also left the feeling between them and their respective gov-

ernments in a far better condition than he found it on his accession to the presidency.

The long-standing and dangerous question of British dominion in Central America, in the hope of settling which Mr. Buchanan had accepted the mission to England, was still pending, but it was at length amicably and honorably settled, under his advice and approbation after he became president, by treaties between Great Britain and the two Central American states, in accordance with the American construction of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Another subject of contention that had long existed between the two countries was removed by President Buchanan in a summary and dignified way. The belligerent right of search had been exercised by Great Britain in the maritime war of 1812. In process of time she undertook to assert a right to detain and search, on the high seas, in time of peace, merchantmen suspected of being engaged in the slave-trade. In 1858 she despatched some cruisers with such orders to the coast of Cuba and the Gulf of Mexico. President Buchanan, always vigilant in protecting the commerce of the country, but mindful of the importance of preventing any necessity for war, remonstrated to the English government against this violation of the freedom of the seas. Then he sent a large naval force to the neighborhood of Cuba with instructions "to protect all vessels of the United States on the

high seas from search or detention by the vessels of war of any other nation." The effect was most salutary. The British government receded, abandoned the claim of the right of search, and recognized the principle of international law in favor of the freedom of the seas.

During the whole of Mr. Buchanan's administration our relations with Mexico were in a complicated and critical position, in consequence of the internal condition of that country and of the danger of interference by European powers. Great outrages were committed in Mexico upon our citizens and their property, and their claims against that government exceeded \$10,000,000. Mr. Buchanan recommended to congress to send assistance to the constitutional government in Mexico, which had been forcibly superseded by military rule, but which still held the allegiance of the majority of the people, and to enforce redress for the wrongs of our citizens. He saw very clearly that, unless active measures should be taken by the government of the United States to reach a power with which a settlement of all claims and difficulties could be effected, some other nation would undertake to establish a government in Mexico, and the United States would then have to interfere, not only to secure the rights of their citizens, but to assert the principle of the Monroe doctrine. He also instructed the Mexican minister, Mr. McLane, to

make a "Treaty of Transit and Commerce" and a "convention to enforce treaty stipulations, and to maintain order and security in the territory of the republics of Mexico and the United States." But congress took no notice of the president's recommendation, and refused to ratify the treaty and the convention. Mexico was left to the interference of Louis Napoleon; the establishment of an empire, under Maximilian, followed, for the embarrassment of President Lincoln's administration while we were in the throes of our civil war, and the claims of American citizens were to all appearance indefinitely postponed.

Our relations with Spain were also in a very unsatisfactory condition at the beginning of Mr. Buchanan's term. There were many just claims of our citizens against the Spanish government for injuries received in Cuba, and Mr. Buchanan succeeded in having a "convention concluded at Madrid in 1860, establishing a joint commission for the final adjudication and payment of all the claims of the respective parties." The senate refused to ratify this convention also, probably because of the intense excitement against slavery, the convention having authorized the presenting before the commissioners of a Spanish claim against the United States for the value of certain slaves. In the settlement of claims against the government of Paraguay the president's firm policy was sec-

ended by congress, and he was authorized to send a commissioner to that country accompanied by "a naval force sufficient to exact justice should negotiation fail." This was entirely successful; full indemnification was obtained without any resort to arms. Mr. Buchanan's negotiations with China, conducted through William B. Reed as minister, were also successful; a treaty was concluded in 1858, which established very satisfactory commercial relations with that country and secured the liquidation of all claims. June 22, 1860, Mr. Buchanan vetoed a bill "to secure homesteads to actual settlers in the public domain, and for other purposes." The other purposes contemplated donations to the states. The ground of the veto was that the power "to dispose of" the territory of the United States did not authorize congress to donate public lands to the states for their domestic purposes. In the senate the bill failed to receive the two thirds majority necessary to pass it over the veto.

In internal affairs the preceding administration of President Pierce had left a legacy of trouble to his successor in the repeal of the Missouri compromise, which was followed by a terrible period of lawlessness and bloodshed in Kansas, under what was called "squatter sovereignty," the slavery and the anti-slavery parties among the settlers struggling for supremacy. The pro-slavery party sus-

tained the territorial government and obtained control of its legislature. The anti-slavery party repudiated this legislature and held a convention at Topeka to institute an opposition government. Congress had recognized the authority of the territorial government, and Mr. Buchanan, as president, had no alternative but to recognize and uphold it also. The fact that the legislature of that government was in the hands of the pro-slavery party made the course he adopted seem as if he favored their pro-slavery designs, while, in truth, he had no object to subserve but to sustain, as he was officially obliged to sustain, the government that congress had recognized as the lawful government of the territory. Now, throughout the north, the press and the public began to teem with denunciation of the new president, who had not allowed revolutionary violence to prevail over the law of the land, and this was kept up throughout his administration. The anti-slavery party gained ground, and the election of 1860 resulted in the triumph of Mr. Lincoln.

Mr. Buchanan was a conservative and far-seeing man, who, though opposed to slavery, believed that the blind and fanatical interference of the northern abolitionists in the domestic affairs of the southern states would excite the latter in a manner dangerous to the peace and prosperity of the union. His messages constantly recommended conciliatory leg-

islative measures; but congress paid no attention to his advice. Finally the election of Mr. Lincoln was seized upon as the signal in South Carolina for the breaking out of her old doctrine of secession. She passed her ordinance of secession on December 20, 1860. Mr. Buchanan never for a moment admitted that a state had any power to secede from the union. South Carolina had once and forever adopted and ratified the constitution of the United States, and he maintained that she had by this act permanently resigned certain powers to the federal government, and that she could not, by her own will and without the consent of the other states, resume those powers and declare herself independent. She could, if actually oppressed by the general government, seek to redress her wrongs by revolution; but never by secession. He refused to receive, in their assumed official capacity, the commissioners sent by South Carolina, in December, 1860, to treat with him as with a foreign power.

In October, 1860, before the election, Mr. Buchanan received from Gen. Scott, the general-in-chief of the army, a communication saying that, in the event of Mr. Lincoln's election, Gen. Scott anticipated that there would be a secession of one or more of the southern states; and that, from the general rashness of the southern character, there was danger of a "preliminary" seizure of certain southern forts. This paper became known as

“General Scott’s Views.” It was the foundation, at a later period, of a charge that President Buchanan had been warned by Gen. Scott of the danger of leaving the southern forts without sufficient garrisons to prevent surprises, and that he had neglected this warning. Mr. Buchanan, who had publicly denied the right of secession, could not furnish the southern states with any justification of such a proceeding by prematurely re-enforcing the forts as if he anticipated secession. But, even if the president had wished to adopt such a measure, there were, as Gen. Scott himself said, but five companies of regular troops, or 400 men, available for the garrisoning of nine fortifications in six highly excited southern states. The remainder of the army was scattered over the western plains. Scott’s views were clearly impracticable, and produced no impression upon the president’s mind.

Mr. Buchanan has been often and severely reproached for a “temporizing policy” and a want of such vigor as might have averted the civil war; but the policy of Mr. Lincoln’s administration, until after the attack on Fort Sumter, was identical with that of Mr. Buchanan. In his annual message of December 5, 1860, Mr. Buchanan stated clearly and forcibly his denial of the right of secession, and also his conviction that if a state should adopt such an unconstitutional measure the federal government had no power, under the constitution, to

make aggressive war upon her to compel her to remain in the union; but at the same time drawing a definite distinction between this and the right of the use of force against individuals, in spite of secession, in enforcing the execution of federal laws and in the preservation of federal property. This doctrine met the secessionists upon their own ground; for it denied that a state ordinance of secession could absolve its people from obeying the laws of the United States. Mr. Buchanan thus framed the only justifiable basis of a civil war, and left upon the records of the country the clear line of demarcation that would have to be observed by his successor and would make the use of force, if force must be used, a war, not of aggression, but of defence.

In order to disarm all unreasonable opposition from the south, Mr. Buchanan urged upon congress the adoption of an "explanatory amendment" of the constitution, which should effectually secure to slave-holders all their constitutional rights. From all parts of the country, north and south, he received private letters approving, on various grounds, the tone of the message; but nearly the whole of the republican party saw fit to treat it as a denial by the president of any power to enforce the laws against the citizens of a state after secession, and even after actual rebellion; while this very power, emphatically stated as it was in the message,

was made by the secessionists their ground of attack. It was the great misfortune of Mr. Buchanan's position that he had to appeal to a congress in which there were two sectional parties breathing mutual defiance; in which broad and patriotic statesmanship was confined to a small body of men, who could not win over to their views a sufficient number from either of the parties to make up a majority upon any proposition whatever. In the hope of preventing the secession of South Carolina, the president sent Caleb Cushing to Charleston, with a letter to Gov. Pickens, urging the people of the state to await the action of congress.

After the actual secession of South Carolina, Mr. Buchanan's two great objects were: 1. To confine the area of secession, so that if there was to be a southern confederacy it might comprehend only the cotton states, which were most likely to act together. 2. To induce congress to prepare for a civil war in case one should be precipitated. While he made it apparent to congress that at that time he was without the necessary executive powers to enforce the collection of the revenue in South Carolina, he did not fail to call for the appropriate powers and means. But at no time during that session did a single republican senator (and the republicans had a majority in the senate), in any form whatever, give his vote or his influence for any measure that would strengthen the hands of

My dear Sir /

I send what I have
sketched for your supervision &
correction or addition. You will
oblige me much by attending to the
business immediately. I have but
little time.

Yr. friend

James Buchanan

the president either in maintaining peace or in executing the laws of the United States. Whatever was the governing motive for their inaction, it never can be said that they were not seasonably warned by the president that a policy of inaction would be fatal. That policy not only crippled him, but crippled his successor. When Mr. Lincoln came into office, seven states had already seceded, and not a single law had been put upon the statute-book that would enable the executive to meet such a condition of the union.

Mr. Crittenden, of Kentucky, had introduced into the senate a resolution, which became known as the "Crittenden Compromise," providing in substance for a restoration of the Missouri compromise-line of $36^{\circ} 30'$; and it was proposed that this question should be referred to a direct vote of the people in the several states. On January 8, 1861, Mr. Buchanan sent a special message to congress, strongly recommending the adoption of this measure; but it produced no effect. During the last three months of his term there were several changes in his cabinet. Mr. Cobb resigned his portfolio on December 8, 1860, and Mr. Thomas, who succeeded him as secretary of the treasury, also resigned on January 11, their sympathies being with the secessionists. This department was then taken by Gen. John A. Dix. Mr. Thompson, secretary of the interior, resigned on January 8,

also because he was a southern man, and the duties of this office were subsequently performed by Moses Kelly, chief clerk. Gen. Cass and Gov. Floyd resigned their offices in December; Judge Black was transferred from the attorney-generalship to the state department, and Edwin M. Stanton became attorney-general. Joseph Holt succeeded Secretary Floyd in the war department.

The two critical questions which it was important that the president should correctly and consistently decide were, whether he was to receive in their assumed official character any commissioners sent by the southern states as to a foreign power, and whether re-enforcements should be sent to Maj. Anderson at Fort Sumter, or to any other southern fort. Mr. Buchanan always refused to receive both the South Carolina commissioners and also Mr. Crawford, the first of the commissioners from the confederate government at Montgomery, who arrived in Washington just before the close of his term; he thus left the new president entirely free to act as he saw best, and entirely untrammelled by any previous pledges. As to re-enforcements for southern forts, Maj. Anderson was instructed to report to the government any necessity for assistance, and in the meantime an expedition was fitted out at New York and held in readiness to sail at an hour's notice. Until the close of Mr. Buchanan's administration, Maj. Anderson considered himself

sufficiently strong, and agreed with the president that any unnecessary movement of troops would be regarded by the south as a menace and would provoke hostilities. Mr. Buchanan would not initiate a civil war; his policy was entirely defensive; and yet he did all that he could, constitutionally, to avert a war. It has often been asked, Why did Mr. Buchanan suffer state after state to go out of the union? Why did he not call on the north for volunteers, and put down rebellion in its first stage? The president had no power to call for volunteers under any existing law; congress, during the whole winter, refused to pass any law to provide him with men or money. In the application of all the means that he had for protecting the public property, he omitted no step that could have been taken with safety, and, at the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, Maj. Anderson not only held Fort Sumter, but had held it down to that time in perfect confidence that he could maintain his position.

On March 9, 1861, Mr. Buchanan returned to his home at Wheatland, rejoicing to be free from the cares of a long and responsible public life, and welcomed by an immense gathering of his neighbors and the citizens of Lancaster. Here he lived quietly for the remaining seven years of his life, taking, however, a lively interest in public affairs, and always supporting, with his influence, as a private citizen, the maintenance of the war for the

restoration of the union. His health was generally good throughout his whole life. After his final return to Wheatland he began to be attacked occasionally by rheumatic gout, and this malady at last terminated his life in his seventy-eighth year. His remains were interred in a cemetery near Lancaster. No man was ever treated with greater injustice than he was during the last seven years of his life by a large part of the public. Men said he was a secessionist; he was a traitor; he had given away the authority of the government; he had been weak and vacillating; he had shut his eyes when men about him, the very ministers of his cabinet, were plotting the destruction of the union; he was old and timid; he might have crushed an incipient rebellion, and he had encouraged it. But he bore all this with patience and dignity, forbearing to say anything against the new administration, and confident that posterity would acknowledge that he had done his duty.

In 1862 he was attacked by Gen. Scott, who made several statements concerning the president's management of the Fort Sumter affairs during the last winter of his administration, which Mr. Buchanan successfully refuted. Mr. Buchanan's loyalty to the constitution of the United States was unbounded. He was not a man of brilliant genius, nor did he ever do any one thing to make his name illustrious and immortal, as Webster did when he

defended the constitution against the heresy of nullification. But in the course of a long, useful, and consistent life filled with the exercise of talents of a fine order and uniform ability, he had made the constitution of his country the object of his deepest affection, the constant guide of all his public acts. He published a vindication of the policy of his administration during the last month of his term, "Buchanan's Administration" (New York, 1866). See "Life of President Buchanan," by George Ticknor Curtis (2 vols., 1883).

HARRIET LANE JOHNSTON was born in Mercersburg, Pa., in 1833. She was the daughter of Elliott T. Lane and his wife, June Buchanan, who, dying, left her to the care of her uncle, James Buchanan. She was educated at the Roman Catholic convent in Georgetown, D. C., and, on the appointment of Mr. Buchanan to the English mission in 1853, accompanied him to London, where she dispensed the hospitalities of the embassy. During his term as chief magistrate she was mistress of the White House, over which she presided with grace and dignity, receiving, among other distinguished guests, the Prince of Wales and his large party. In 1866 she married Elliott Johnston, of Maryland, and after that event resided in Baltimore, Washington, and at Wheatland, surviving her husband

and their two sons. Mrs. Johnston died in Washington July 3, 1903, bequeathing the bulk of her fortune to the Cathedral of the Protestant Episcopal Church of that city.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

BY

JOHN HAY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, sixteenth president of the United States, born in Hardin County, Ky., February 12, 1809; died in Washington, D. C., April 15, 1865. His earliest ancestor in America seems to have been Samuel Lincoln, of Norwich, England, who settled in Hingham, Mass., where he died, leaving a son, Mordecai, whose son of the same name removed to Monmouth, N. J., and thence to Berks County, Pa., dying there in 1735. He was a man of some property, which at his death was divided among his sons and daughters, one of whom, John Lincoln, having disposed of his land in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, established himself in Rockingham County, Va. The records of that county show that he was possessed of a valuable estate, which was divided among five sons, one of whom, named Abraham, emigrated to Kentucky about 1780. At this time Daniel Boone was engaged in those labors and exploits in the new country of Kentucky that have rendered his name illustrious; and there is no doubt that Abraham Lincoln was induced by his friendship for Boone to give up what seems to have been an assured social position

in Virginia and take his family to share with him the risks and hardships of life in the new territory. The families of Boone and Lincoln had been closely allied for many years. Several marriages had taken place between them, and their names occur in each other's wills as friends and executors.

The pioneer Lincoln, who took with him what for the time and place was a sufficient provision in money, the result of the sale of his property in Virginia, acquired by means of cash and land-warrants a large estate in Kentucky, as is shown by the records of Jefferson and Campbell Counties. About 1784 he was killed by Indians while working with his three sons—Mordecai, Josiah, and Thomas—in clearing the forest. His widow removed after his death to Washington County, and there brought up her family. The two elder sons became reputable citizens, and the two daughters married in a decent condition of life. Thomas, the youngest son, seems to have been below the average of the family in enterprise and other qualities that command success. He learned the trade of a carpenter, and married, June 12, 1806, Nancy Hanks, a niece of the man with whom he learned his trade. She is represented, by those who knew her at the time of her marriage, as a handsome young woman of twenty-three, of appearance and intellect superior to her lowly fortunes. The young couple began house-keeping with little means. Three children were

born to them; the first, a girl, who grew to maturity, married, and died, leaving no children; the third, a boy, who died in infancy; the second was Abraham Lincoln.

Thomas Lincoln remained in Kentucky until 1816, when he resolved to remove to the still newer country of Indiana, and settled in a rich and fertile forest country near Little Pigeon creek, not far distant from the Ohio river. The family suffered from diseases incident to pioneer life, and Mrs. Lincoln died in 1818 at the age of thirty-five. Thomas Lincoln, while on a visit to Kentucky, married a worthy, industrious, and intelligent widow named Sarah Bush Johnston. She was a woman of admirable order and system in her habits, and brought to the home of the pioneer in the Indiana timber many of the comforts of civilized life. The neighborhood was one of the roughest. The president once said of it: "It was a wild region, with many bears and other wild animals still in the woods, and there were some schools, so-called; but no qualification was ever required of a teacher beyond readin', writin', and cipherin' to the rule of three. If a straggler supposed to understand Latin happened to sojourn in the neighborhood, he was looked upon as a wizard. There was absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education." But in spite of this the boy Abraham made the best use of the limited opportunities afforded him, and

250 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

learned all that the half-educated backwoods teachers could impart; and besides this he read over and over all the books he could find. He practised constantly the rules of arithmetic, which he had acquired at school, and began, even in his early childhood, to put in writing his recollections of what he had read and his impressions of what he saw about him. By the time he was nineteen years of age he had acquired a remarkably clear and serviceable handwriting, and showed sufficient business capacity to be intrusted with a cargo of farm products, which he took to New Orleans and sold. In 1830 his father emigrated once more, to Macon County, Ill. Lincoln had by this time attained his extraordinary stature of six feet four inches, and with it enormous muscular strength, which was at once put at the disposal of his father in building his cabin, clearing the field, and splitting from the walnut forests, which were plentiful in that county, the rails with which the farm was fenced. Thomas Lincoln, however, soon deserted this new home, his last migration being to Goose Nest Prairie, in Coles County, where he died in 1851, seventy-three years of age. In his last days he was tenderly cared for by his son.

Abraham Lincoln left his father's house as soon as the farm was fenced and cleared, hired himself to a man named Denton Offutt, in Sangamon County, assisted him to build a flat-boat, accompa-

nied him to New Orleans on a trading voyage, and returned with him to New Salem, in Menard County, where Offutt opened a store for the sale of general merchandise. Little was accomplished in this way, and Lincoln employed his too abundant leisure in constant reading and study. He learned during this time the elements of English grammar, and made a beginning in the study of surveying and the principles of law. But the next year an Indian war began, occasioned by the return of Black Hawk with his bands of Sacs and Foxes from Iowa to Illinois. Lincoln volunteered in a company raised in Sangamon County, and was immediately elected captain. His company was organized at Richland on April 21, 1832; but his service in command of it was brief, for it was mustered out on May 27. Lincoln immediately re-enlisted as a private, and served for several weeks in that capacity, being finally mustered out on June 16, 1832, by Lieut. Robert Anderson, who afterward commanded Fort Sumter at the beginning of the civil war. He returned home and began a hasty canvass for election to the legislature. His name had been announced in the spring before his enlistment; but now only ten days were left before the election, which took place in August. In spite of these disadvantages, he made a good race and was far from the foot of the poll. Although he was defeated, he gained the almost unanimous vote of his own neighborhood,

New Salem giving him 277 votes against 3. He now began to look about him for employment, and for a time thought seriously of learning the trade of a blacksmith; but an opportunity presented itself to buy the only store in the settlement, which he did, giving his notes for the whole amount involved. He was associated with an idle and dissolute partner, and the business soon went to wreck, leaving Lincoln burdened with a debt which it required several years of frugality and industry for him to meet; but it was finally paid in full.

After this failure he devoted himself with greatest earnestness and industry to the study of law. He was appointed postmaster of New Salem in 1833, an office which he held for three years. The emoluments of the place were very slight, but it gave him opportunities for reading. At the same time he was appointed deputy to John Calhoun, the county surveyor, and, his modest wants being supplied by these two functions, he gave his remaining leisure unreservedly to the study of law and politics. He was a candidate for the legislature in August, 1834, and was elected this time at the head of the list. He was re-elected in 1836, 1838, and 1840, after which he declined further election. After entering the legislature he did not return to New Salem, but, having by this time attained some proficiency in the law, he removed to Springfield, where he went into partnership with John T.



HOME OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN, SPRINGFIELD, ILLS.

Stuart, whose acquaintance he had begun in the Black Hawk war and continued at Vandalia. He took rank from the first among the leading members of the legislature. He was instrumental in having the state capital removed from Vandalia to Springfield, and during his eight years of service his ability, industry, and weight of character gained him such standing among his associates that in his last two terms he was the candidate of his party for the speakership of the house of representatives. In 1846 he was elected to congress, his opponent being the Rev. Peter Cartwright. The most important congressional measure with which his name was associated during his single term of service was a scheme for the emancipation of the slaves in the District of Columbia, which in the prevailing temper of the time was refused consideration by congress. He was not a candidate for re-election, but for the first and only time in his life he applied for an executive appointment, the commissioner-ship of the general land-office. The place was given to another man, but President Taylor's administration offered Mr. Lincoln the governorship of the territory of Oregon, which he declined.

Mr. Lincoln had by this time become the most influential exponent of the principles of the Whig party in Illinois, and his services were in request in every campaign. After his return from congress he devoted himself with great assiduity and

success to the practice of law, and speedily gained a commanding position at the bar. As he says himself, he was losing his interest in politics when the repeal of the Missouri compromise aroused him again. The profound agitation of the question of slavery, which in 1854 followed the repeal of the Missouri compromise, awakened all the energies of Lincoln's nature. He regarded this act, in which Senator Douglas was the most prominent agent of the reactionary party, as a gross breach of faith, and began at once a series of earnest political discussions which immediately placed him at the head of the party that, not only in Illinois but throughout the west, was speedily formed to protest against and oppose the throwing open of the territories to the encroachments of slavery. The legislature elected in Illinois in the heat of this discussion contained a majority of members opposed to the policy of Douglas. The duty of selecting a senator in place of Gen. Shields, whose term was closing, devolved upon this legislature, and Mr. Lincoln was the unanimous choice of the Whig members. But they did not command a clear majority of the legislature. There were four members of Democratic antecedents who, while they were ardently opposed to the extension of slavery, were not willing to cast their votes for a Whig candidate, and adhered tenaciously through several ballots to Lyman Trumbull, a Democrat

of their own way of thinking. Lincoln, fearing that this dissension among the anti-slavery men might result in the election of a supporter of Douglas, urged his friends to go over in a body to the support of Trumbull, and his influence was sufficient to accomplish this result. Trumbull was elected, and for many years served the Republican cause in the senate with ability and zeal.

As soon as the Republican party became fully organized in the nation, embracing in its ranks the anti-slavery members of the old Whig and Democratic parties, Mr. Lincoln, by general consent, took his place at the head of the party in Illinois; and when, in 1858, Senator Douglas sought a re-election to the senate, the Republicans with one voice selected Mr. Lincoln as his antagonist. He had already made several speeches of remarkable eloquence and power against the pro-slavery reaction of which the Nebraska bill was the significant beginning, and when Mr. Douglas returned to Illinois to begin his canvass for the senate he was challenged by Mr. Lincoln to a series of joint discussions. The challenge was accepted, and the most remarkable oratorical combat the state had ever witnessed took place between them during the summer. Mr. Douglas defended his thesis of non-intervention with slavery in the territories (the doctrine known as "popular sovereignty," and derided as "squatter sovereignty") with remarkable

adroitness and energy. The ground that Mr. Lincoln took was higher and bolder than had yet been assumed by any American statesman of his time. In the brief and sententious speech in which he accepted the championship of his party, before the Republican convention of June 16, 1858, he uttered the following pregnant and prophetic words: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall; but I do expect that it will cease to be divided. It will become all the one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the states, old as well as new, north as well as south."

This bold utterance excited the fears of his timid friends, and laid him open to the hackneyed and conventional attacks of the supporters of slavery; but throughout the contest, while he did not for an instant lower this lofty tone of opposition to slavery and hope of its extinction, he refused to be crowded by the fears of his friends or the denunciations of his enemies away from the strictly constitutional ground upon which his opposition was made. The debates between him and Senator Douglas aroused

extraordinary interest throughout the state and the country. The men were perhaps equally matched in oratorical ability and adroitness in debate, but Lincoln's superiority in moral insight, and especially in far-seeing political sagacity, soon became apparent. The most important and significant of the debates was that which took place at Freeport. Mr. Douglas had previously asked Mr. Lincoln a series of questions intended to embarrass him, which Lincoln without the slightest reserve answered by a categorical yes or no. At Freeport, Lincoln, taking his turn, inquired of Douglas whether the people of a territory could in any lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits prior to the formation of a state constitution. By his reply, intimating that slavery might be excluded by unfriendly territorial legislation, Douglas gained a momentary advantage in the anti-slavery region in which he spoke, but dealt a fatal blow to his popularity in the south, the result of which was seen two years afterward at the Charleston convention. The ground assumed by Senator Douglas was, in fact, utterly untenable, and Lincoln showed this in one of his terse sentences. "Judge Douglas holds," he said, "that a thing may lawfully be driven away from a place where it has a lawful right to go."

This debate established the reputation of Mr. Lincoln as one of the leading orators of the Re-

publican party of the Union, and a speech that he delivered at Cooper Institute, in New York, on February 27, 1860, in which he showed that the unbroken record of the founders of the republic was in favor of the restriction of slavery and against its extension, widened and confirmed his reputation; so that when the Republican convention came together in Chicago in May, 1860, he was nominated for the presidency on the third ballot, over William H. Seward, who was his principal competitor. The Democratic convention, which met in Charleston, S. C., broke up after numerous fruitless ballotings, and divided into two sections. The southern half, unable to trust Mr. Douglas with the interests of slavery after his Freeport speech, first adjourned to Richmond, but again joined the other half at Baltimore, where a second disruption took place, after which the southern half nominated John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, and the northern portion nominated Mr. Douglas. John Bell, of Tennessee, was nominated by the so-called Constitutional Union party. Lincoln, therefore, supported by the entire anti-slavery sentiment of the north, gained an easy victory over the three other parties. The election took place on November 6, and when the electoral college cast their votes Lincoln was found to have 180, Breckinridge 72, Bell 39, and Douglas 12. The popular vote stood:

for Lincoln, 1,866,462; for Douglas, 1,375,157; for Breckinridge, 847,953; for Bell, 590,631.

The extreme partisans of slavery had not even waited for the election of Lincoln to begin their preparations for an insurrection, and as soon as the result was declared a movement for separation was begun in South Carolina, and it carried along with her the states of Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. A provisional government, styled the "Confederate States of America," of which Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, was made president, was promptly organized, and seized, with few exceptions, all the posts, arsenals, and public property of the United States within their limits. Confronted by this extraordinary crisis, Mr. Lincoln kept his own counsel, and made no public expression of his intentions or his policy until he was inaugurated on March 4, 1861.

He called about him a cabinet of the most prominent members of the anti-slavery parties of the nation, giving no preference to any special faction. His secretary of state was William H. Seward, of New York, who had been his principal rival for the nomination, and whose eminence and abilities designated him as the leading member of the administration; the secretary of the treasury was Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio, whose pre-eminence in the west was as unquestioned as Seward's in the east; of war, Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, the

most influential politician of that state; of the navy, Gideon Welles, of Connecticut; of the interior, Caleb B. Smith, of Indiana; the border slave-states were represented in the government by Edward Bates, of Missouri, attorney-general, and Montgomery Blair, of Maryland, postmaster-general—both of them men of great distinction of character and high standing as lawyers. Seward, Smith, and Bates were of Whig antecedents; all the rest of Democratic. The cabinet underwent, in the course of Mr. Lincoln's term, the following modifications: Sec. Chase, after a brilliant administration of the finances, resigned in 1864 from personal reasons, and was succeeded by William P. Fessenden, of Maine; Sec. Cameron left the war department at the close of the year 1861, and was appointed minister to Russia, and his place was taken by Edwin M. Stanton, a war Democrat of singular energy and vigor, and equal ability and devotion; Sec. Smith, accepting a judgeship, gave way to John P. Usher, of Indiana; Attorney-General Bates resigned in the last year of the administration, and was succeeded by James Speed, of Kentucky; and Postmaster-General Blair about the same time gave way to William Dennison, of Ohio.

In his inaugural address President Lincoln treated the acts of secession as a nullity. He declared the Union perpetual and inviolate, and announced with perfect firmness, though with the

greatest moderation of speech and feeling, the intention of the government to maintain its authority and to hold the places under its jurisdiction. He made an elaborate and unanswerable argument against the legality as well as the justice of secession, and further showed, with convincing clearness, that peaceful secession was impossible. "Can aliens make treaties," he said, "easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war; you cannot fight always, and when, after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you." He pleaded for peace in a strain of equal tenderness and dignity, and in closing he said: "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have a most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it." This speech profoundly affected the public opinion of the north; but in the excited state of sentiment that then controlled the south it naturally met only contempt and defiance in that section. A few weeks later the inevitable war began, in an attack upon Fort Sumter by the secessionists of

South Carolina under Gen. P. G. T. Beauregard, and after a long bombardment the fort surrendered on April 13, 1861. The president instantly called for a force of 75,000 three-months' militiamen, and three weeks later ordered the enlistment of 64,000 soldiers and 18,000 seamen for three years. He set on foot a blockade of the southern ports, and called congress together in special session, choosing for their day of meeting July 4. The remaining states of the south rapidly arrayed themselves on one side or the other; all except Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri were drawn into the secession movement, and the western part of Virginia, adhering to the Union, under the name of West Virginia, separated itself from that ancient commonwealth.

The first important battle of the war took place at Bull Run, near Manassas station, Va., July 21, 1861, and resulted in the defeat of the National troops under Gen. Irwin McDowell by a somewhat larger force of the Confederates under Gens. Joseph E. Johnston and Beauregard. Though the loss in killed and wounded was not great, and was about the same on both sides, the victory was still one of the utmost importance for the Confederates, and gave them a great increase of prestige on both sides of the Atlantic. They were not, however, able to pursue their advantage. The summer was passed in enlisting, drilling, and equipping a formidable National army on the banks of the

Potomac, which was given in charge of Gen. George B. McClellan, a young officer who had distinguished himself by a successful campaign in western Virginia. In spite of the urgency of the government, which was increased by the earnestness of the people and their representatives in congress, Gen. McClellan made no advance until the spring of 1862, when Gen. Johnston, in command of the Confederate army, evacuated the position which, with about 45,000 men, he had held during the autumn and winter against the Army of the Potomac, amounting to about 177,000 effectives. Gen. McClellan then transferred his army to the peninsula between the James and York rivers. Although there was but a force of 16,000 opposed to him when he landed, he spent a month before the works at Yorktown, and when he was prepared to open fire upon them they were evacuated, and Gen. Johnston retreated to the neighborhood of Richmond. The battle of Seven Pines, in which the Confederates, successful in their first attack, were afterward repelled, was fought on May 31, 1862. Johnston was wounded, and the command devolved upon Gen. Robert E. Lee, who in the latter part of June moved out from his position before Richmond and attacked McClellan's right flank, under Gen. Fitz-John Porter, at Gaines's Mills, north of the Chickahominy. Porter, with one corps, resisted the Confederate army all day with

great gallantry, unassisted by the main army under McClellan, but withdrew in the evening, and McClellan at once began his retreat to the James river. Several battles were fought on the way, in which the Confederates were checked; but the retreat continued until the National army reached the James.

Taking position at Malvern Hill, they inflicted a severe defeat upon Gen. Lee, but were immediately after withdrawn by Gen. McClellan to Harrison's Landing. Here, as at other times during his career, McClellan labored under a strange hallucination as to the numbers of his enemy. He generally estimated them at not less than twice their actual force, and continually reproached the president for not giving him impossible re-enforcements to equal the imaginary numbers he thought opposed to him. In point of fact, his army was always in excess of that of Johnston or Lee. The continual disasters in the east were somewhat compensated by a series of brilliant successes in the west. In February, 1862, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant had captured the Confederate forts Henry and Donelson, thus laying open the great strategic lines of the Tennessee and Cumberland rivers, and, moving southward, had fought (April 6 and 7) the battle of Shiloh, with unfavorable results on the first day, which were turned to a victory on the second with the aid of Gen. D. C. Buell and his army, a battle in which Gen. Albert Sidney John-

ston was killed and the Confederate invasion of Kentucky baffled. Farragut, on April 24, had won a brilliant naval victory, over the twin forts above the mouths of the Mississippi, which resulted in the capture of New Orleans and the control of the lower Mississippi. After Gen. McClellan's retreat to the James, the president visited the army at Harrison's Landing (July 8), and, after careful consultations with the corps commanders, became convinced that in the actual disposition of the officers and the troops there was no reasonable expectation of a successful movement upon Richmond by McClellan. An order was therefore issued for the withdrawal of the army from the James, and, Gen. Halleck having been appointed general-in-chief, Gen. Pope was sent forward from Washington with a small force to delay the Confederate army under Gen. Lee until the Army of the Potomac could arrive and be concentrated to support him. McClellan's movements, however, were so deliberate, and there was such a want of confidence and co-operation on the part of his officers toward Gen. Pope, that the National army met with decisive defeat on the same battle-field of Bull Run that saw their first disaster. Gen. Pope, disheartened by the lack of sympathy and support that he discerned among the most eminent officers of the Army of the Potomac, retreated upon Washington, and Gen. McClellan, who seemed to

be the only officer under whom the army was at the moment willing to serve, was placed in command of it. Gen. Lee, elated with his success, crossed the Potomac, but was met by the army under McClellan at South Mountain and Antietam, and after two days of great slaughter Lee retreated into Virginia.

President Lincoln availed himself of this occasion to give effect to a resolve that had long been maturing in his mind in an act the most momentous in its significance and results that the century has witnessed. For a year and a half he had been subjected to urgent solicitations from the two great political parties of the country, the one side appealing to him to take decided measures against slavery, and the other imploring him to pursue a conservative course in regard to that institution. His deep-rooted detestation of the system of domestic servitude was no secret to any one; but his reverence for the law, his regard for vested interests, and his anxiety to do nothing that should alienate any considerable body of the supporters of the government had thus far induced him to pursue a middle course between the two extremes. Meanwhile the power of events had compelled a steady progress in the direction of emancipation. So early as August, 1861, congress had passed an act to confiscate the rights of slave-owners in slaves employed in a manner hostile to the Union, and Gen. Fré-

mont had seized the occasion of the passage of this act to issue an order to confiscate and emancipate the slaves of rebels in the state of Missouri. President Lincoln, unwilling, in a matter of such transcendent importance, to leave the initiative to any subordinate, revoked this order, and directed Gen. Frémont to modify it so that it should conform to the confiscation act of congress. This excited violent opposition to the president among the radical anti-slavery men in Missouri and elsewhere, while it drew upon him the scarcely less embarrassing importunities of the conservatives, who wished him to take still more decided ground against the radicals. On March 6, 1862, he sent a special message to congress inclosing a resolution, the passage of which he recommended, to offer pecuniary aid from the general government to states that should adopt the gradual abolishment of slavery. This resolution was promptly passed by congress; but in none of the slave-states was public sentiment sufficiently advanced to permit them to avail themselves of it.

The next month, however, congress passed a law emancipating slaves in the District of Columbia, with compensation to owners, and President Lincoln had the happiness of affixing his signature to a measure that he had many years before, while a representative from Illinois, fruitlessly urged upon the notice of congress. As the war went on,

wherever the National armies penetrated there was a constant stream of fugitive slaves from the adjoining regions, and the commanders of each department treated the complicated questions arising from this body of "contrabands," as they came to be called, in their camps, according to their own judgment of the necessities or the expediencies of each case, a discretion which the president thought best to tolerate. But on May 9, 1862, Gen. David Hunter, an intimate and esteemed friend of Mr. Lincoln's, saw proper, without consultation with him, to issue a military order declaring all persons theretofore held as slaves in Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina forever free. The president, as soon as he received this order, issued a proclamation declaring it void, and reserving to himself the decision of the question whether it was competent for him, as commander-in-chief of the army and navy, to declare the slaves of any state or states free, and whether at any time or in any case it should have become a necessity indispensable to the maintenance of the government to exercise such supposed power, and prohibiting to commanders in the field the decision of such questions. But he added in his proclamation a significant warning and appeal to the slave-holding states, urging once more upon them the policy of emancipation by state action. "I do not argue," he said; "I beseech you to make the argument for yourselves. You cannot,

if you would, be blind to the signs of the times. I beg of you a calm and enlarged consideration of them, ranging, if it may be, far above personal and partisan politics. This proposal makes common cause for a common object, casting no reproaches upon any. . . . Will you not embrace it? So much good has not been done, by one effort, in all past time, as in the providence of God it is now your high privilege to do. May the vast future not have cause to lament that you have neglected it."

He had several times endeavored to bring this proposition before the members of congress from the loyal slave-holding states, and on July 12 he invited them to meet him at the executive mansion, and submitted to them a powerful and urgent appeal to induce their states to adopt the policy of compensated emancipation. He told them, without reproach or complaint, that he believed that if they had all voted for the resolution in the gradual emancipation message of the preceding March the war would now have been substantially ended, and that the plan therein proposed was still one of the most potent and swift means of ending it. "Let the states," he said, "which are in rebellion see definitely and certainly that in no event will the states you represent ever join their proposed confederacy, and they cannot much longer maintain the contest." While urging this policy upon the conservatives, and while resolved in his own mind upon

emancipation by decree as a last resource, he was the subject of vehement attacks from the more radical anti-slavery supporters of the government, to which he replied with unfailing moderation and good temper. Although in July he had resolved upon his course, and had read to his cabinet a draft of a proclamation of emancipation which he had then laid aside for a more fitting occasion (on the suggestion from Mr. Seward that its issue in the disastrous condition of our military affairs would be interpreted as a sign of desperation), he met the reproaches of the radical Republicans, the entreaties of visiting delegations, and the persuasions of his eager friends with arguments showing both sides of the question of which they persisted in seeing only one. To Horace Greeley, on August 22, Mr. Lincoln said: "My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could do it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that." And even so late as September 13 he said to a delegation of a religious society, who were urging immediate action: "I do not want to issue a document that the whole world will see must necessarily be inoperative, like the pope's bull against the comet. . . . I view this matter as a practical war measure, to be decided on according

to the advantages or disadvantages it may offer to the suppression of the rebellion." Still, he assured them that he had not decided against a proclamation of liberty to the slaves, but that the matter occupied his deepest thoughts.

The retreat of Lee from Maryland after his defeat at Antietam seemed to the president to afford a proper occasion for the execution of his long-matured resolve, and on September 22 he issued his preliminary proclamation, giving notice to the states in rebellion that, on January 1, 1863, all persons held as slaves within any state or designated part of a state, the people whereof should then be in rebellion against the United States, should be then, thenceforward, and forever free. When congress came together on December 1 he urged them to supplement what had already been done by constitutional action, concluding his message with this impassioned appeal: "Fellow-citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or in dishonor to the latest generation. We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve. We shall nobly save, or meanly

lose, the last, best hope of earth. Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud, and God must forever bless.” It was hardly to be expected, however, that any action would be taken by congress before the lapse of the hundred days that the president had left between his warning and its execution. On January 1, 1863, the final proclamation of emancipation was issued. It recited the preliminary document, and then designated the states in rebellion against the United States. They were Arkansas, Texas, a part of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, excepting certain counties. The proclamation then continued: “I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated states and parts of states are, and henceforward shall be, free; and that the executive government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.” The criticisms and forebodings of the opponents of emancipation had well-nigh been exhausted during the previous three months, and the definitive proclamation was received with general enthusiasm throughout the loyal states.

The dissatisfaction with which this important measure was regarded in the border states grad-

ually died away, as did also the opposition in conservative quarters to the enlistment of negro soldiers. Their good conduct, their quick submission to discipline, and their excellent behavior in several battles rapidly made an end of the prejudice against them; and when, in the winter session of congress of 1863-'4, Mr. Lincoln again urged upon the attention of that body the passage of a constitutional amendment abolishing slavery, his proposition met with the concurrence of a majority of congress, though it failed of the necessary two-thirds vote in the house of representatives. During the following year, however, public opinion made rapid progress, and the influence of the president with congress was largely increased after his triumphant re-election. In his annual message of December 6, 1864, he once more pleaded, this time with irresistible force, in favor of constitutional emancipation in all the states. As there had been much controversy during the year in regard to the president's anti-slavery convictions, and the suggestion had been made in many quarters that, for the sake of peace, he might be induced to withdraw the proclamation, he repeated the declaration made the year before: "While I remain in my present position I shall not attempt to retreat or modify the emancipation proclamation; nor shall I return to slavery any person who is free by the terms of that proclamation or by any of the acts of congress. If

274 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

the people should, by whatever mode or means, make it an executive duty to re-enslave such persons, another, and not I, must be their instrument to perform it." This time congress acted with alacrity, and on January 31, 1865, proposed to the states the 13th amendment to the constitution, providing that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, where the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction. The states rapidly adopted the amendment by the action of their legislatures, and the president was especially pleased that his own state of Illinois led the van, having passed the necessary resolution within twenty-four hours. Before the year ended twenty-seven of the thirty-six states (being the necessary three fourths) had ratified the amendment, and President Johnson, on December 18, 1865, officially proclaimed its adoption.

While the energies of the government and of the people were most strenuously occupied with the war and the questions immediately concerning it, the four years of Mr. Lincoln's administration had their full share of complicated and difficult questions of domestic and foreign concern. The interior and post-office departments made great progress in developing the means of communication throughout the country. Mr. Chase, as secretary of the treasury, performed, with prodigious ability and

remarkable success, the enormous duties devolving upon him of providing funds to supply the army at an expense amounting at certain periods to \$3,000,000 a day; and Mr. Seward, in charge of the state department, held at bay the suppressed hostility of European nations. Of all his cabinet, the president sustained with Mr. Seward relations of the closest intimacy, and for that reason, perhaps, shared more directly in the labors of his department. He revised the first draft of most of Seward's important despatches, and changed and amended their language with remarkable wisdom and skill. He was careful to avoid all sources of controversy or ill-feeling with foreign nations, and when they occurred he did his best to settle them in the interests of peace, without a sacrifice of national dignity.

At the end of the year 1861 the friendly relations between England and the United States were seriously threatened by the capture of the confederate envoys, James Murray Mason and John Slidell, on board a British merchant-ship. Public sentiment approved the capture, and, as far as could be judged by every manifestation in the press and in congress, was in favor of retaining the prisoners and defiantly refusing the demand of England for their return. But when the president, after mature deliberation, decided that the capture was against American precedents, and directed their return to

British custody, the second thought of the country was with him. His prudence and moderation were also conspicuously displayed in his treatment of the question of the invasion of Mexico by France, and the establishment by military power of the emperor Maximilian in that country. Accepting as genuine the protestations of the emperor of the French, that he intended no interference with the will of the people of Mexico, he took no measures unfriendly to France or the empire, except those involved in the maintenance of unbroken friendship with the republican government under President Juarez, a proceeding that, although severely criticised by the more ardent spirits in congress, ended, after the president's death, in the triumph of the National party in Mexico and the downfall of the invaders. He left no doubt, however, at any time, in regard to his own conviction that "the safety of the people of the United States and the cheerful destiny to which they aspire are intimately dependent upon the maintenance of free republican institutions throughout Mexico." He dealt in a sterner spirit with the proposition for foreign mediation that the emperor of the French, after seeking in vain the concurrence of other European powers, at last presented singly at the beginning of 1863. This proposition, under the orders of the president, was declined by Mr. Seward on February 6, in a despatch of remarkable ability and dignity, which

put an end to all discussion of overtures of intervention from European powers. The diplomatic relations with England were exceptionally strained at several periods during the war. The building and fitting out of Confederate cruisers in English ports, and their escape, after their construction and its purpose had been made known by the American minister, more than once brought the two nations to the verge of war; but the moderation with which the claims of the United States were made by Mr. Lincoln, the energy and ability displayed by Sec. Seward and by Mr. Charles Francis Adams in presenting these claims, and, it must now be recognized, the candor and honesty with which the matter was treated by Earl Russell, the British minister for foreign affairs, saved the two countries from that irreparable disaster; and the British government at last took such measures as were necessary to put an end to this indirect war from the shores of England upon American commerce. In the course of two years the war attained such proportions that volunteering was no longer a sufficient resource to keep the army, consisting at that time of nearly a million men, at its full fighting strength.

Congress therefore authorized, and the department executed, a scheme of enrolment and draft of the arms-bearing population of the loyal states. Violent opposition arose to this measure in many

parts of the country, which was stimulated by the speeches of orators of the opposition, and led, in many instances, to serious breaches of the public peace. A frightful riot, beginning among the foreign population of New York, kept that city in disorder and terror for three days in July, 1863. But the riots were suppressed, the disturbances quieted at last, and the draft was executed throughout the country. Clement L. Vallandigham, of Ohio, one of the most eloquent and influential orators of the Democratic party, was arrested in Ohio by Gen. Burnside for his violent public utterances in opposition to the war, tried by a military court, and sentenced to imprisonment during the continuance of the war. The president changed his sentence to that of transportation within the lines of the rebellion. These proceedings caused a great ferment among his party in Ohio, who, by way of challenge to the government, nominated him for governor of that state. A committee of its prominent politicians demanded from the president his restoration to his political rights, and a correspondence took place between them and the president, in which the rights and powers of the government in case of rebellion were set forth by him with great lucidity and force. His letters exercised an important influence in the political discussions of the year, and Mr. Vallandigham was defeated in

his candidacy by John Brough by a majority of 100,000 votes.

The war still continued at a rate that appears rapid enough in retrospect, but seemed slow to the eager spirits watching its course. The disasters of the Army of the Potomac did not end with the removal of Gen. McClellan, which took place in November, 1862, as a consequence of his persistent delay in pursuing Lee's retreating army after the battle of Antietam. Gen. Burnside, who succeeded him, suffered a humiliating defeat in his attack upon the intrenched position of the Confederates at Fredericksburg. Gen. Hooker, who next took command, after opening his campaign by crossing the Rapidan in a march of extraordinary brilliancy, was defeated at Chancellorsville, in a battle where both sides lost severely, and then retired again north of the river. Gen. Lee, leaving the National army on his right flank, crossed the Potomac, and Hooker having, at his own request, been relieved and succeeded by Gen. Meade, the two armies met in a three days' battle at Gettysburg, Pa., where Gen. Lee sustained a decisive defeat, and was driven back into Virginia. His flight from Gettysburg began on the evening of July 4, a day that in this year doubled its lustre as a historic anniversary. For on this day Vicksburg, the most important Confederate stronghold in the west, surrendered to Gen. Grant. He had spent the early months of

1863 in successive attempts to take that fortress, all of which had failed; but on the last day of April he crossed the river at Grand Bluff, and within a few days fought the successful battles of Port Gibson, Raymond, Jackson, Champion Hills, and the Big Black river, and shut up the army of Pemberton in close siege in the city of Vicksburg, which he finally captured with about 30,000 men on July 4.

The speech that Mr. Lincoln delivered at the dedication of the National cemetery on the battlefield of Gettysburg, November 19, 1863, was at once recognized as the philosophy in brief of the whole great struggle, and has already become classic. There are three slightly differing versions; the one that is here given is a literal transcript of the speech as he afterward wrote it out for a fair in Baltimore:

“Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting-place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper

that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.”

Gen. Grant was transferred to Chattanooga, where, in November, with the troops of Thomas, Hooker, and Sherman, he won the important victory of Missionary Ridge; and then, being appointed lieutenant-general and general-in-chief of the armies of the United States, he went to Washington and entered upon the memorable campaign of 1864. This campaign began with revived hopes on the part of the government, the people, and the army. The president, glad that the army

had now at its head a general in whose ability and enterprise he could thoroughly confide, ceased from that moment to exercise any active influence on its movements. He wrote, on April 30, to Gen. Grant: "The particulars of your plans I neither know nor seek to know. You are vigilant and self-reliant, and, pleased with this, I wish not to obtrude any constraints or restraints upon you. . . . If there is anything wanting which is in my power to give, do not fail to let me know it. And now, with a brave army and a just cause, may God sustain you." Grant crossed the Rapidan on May 4, intending to move by the right flank of Gen. Lee; but the two armies came together in a gloomy forest called the Wilderness, where, from the 5th to the 7th of May, one of the most sanguinary battles known to modern warfare was fought. Neither side having gained any decisive advantage in this deadly struggle, Grant moved to the left, and Lee met him again at Spottsylvania Court-House, where for ten days a series of destructive contests took place, in which both sides were alternately successful. Still moving to the left, Grant again encountered the enemy at the crossing of North Anna river, and still later at Cold Harbor, a few miles northeast of Richmond, where, assaulting Gen. Lee's army in a fortified position, he met with a bloody repulse. He then crossed the James river, intending by a rapid movement to seize Petersburg and the Con-

federate lines of communication south of Richmond, but was baffled in this purpose, and forced to enter upon a regular siege of Petersburg, which occupied the summer and autumn. While these operations were in progress, Gen. Philip H. Sheridan had made one of the most brilliant cavalry raids in the war, threatening Richmond and defeating the Confederate cavalry under Gen. J. E. B. Stuart, and killing that famous leader. While Grant lay before Richmond, Gen. Lee, hoping to induce him to attack his works, despatched a force under Gen. Early to threaten Washington; but Grant sent two corps of his army northward, and Early—after a sharp skirmish under the fortifications of Washington, where Mr. Lincoln was personally present—was driven back through the Shenandoah valley, and on two occasions, in September and October, was signally defeated by Gen. Sheridan.

Gen. William T. Sherman, who had been left in command of the western district formerly commanded by Grant, moved southward at the same time that Grant crossed the Rapidan. Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, one of the ablest of the Confederate generals, retired gradually before him, defending himself at every halt with the greatest skill and address; but, his movements not proving satisfactory to the Richmond government, he was removed, and Gen. John B. Hood appointed in his place. After a summer of hard fighting, Sherman, on

September 1, captured Atlanta, one of the chief manufacturing and railroad centres of the south, and later in the autumn organized and executed a magnificent march to the seaboard, which proved that the military power of the Confederacy had been concentrated at a few points on the frontier, and that the interior was little more than an empty shell. He reached the sea-coast early in December, investing Savannah on the 10th, and capturing the city on the 21st. He then marched northward with the intention of assisting Gen. Grant in the closing scenes of the war. The army under Gen. George H. Thomas, who had been left in Tennessee to hold Hood in check while this movement was going on, after severely handling the Confederates in the preliminary battle of Franklin, November 30, inflicted upon General Hood a crushing and final defeat in the battle of Nashville, December 16, routing and driving him from the state.

During the summer, while Grant was engaged in the desperate and indecisive series of battles that marked his southward progress in Virginia, and Sherman had not yet set out upon his march to the sea, one of the most ardent political canvasses the country had ever seen was in progress at the north. Mr. Lincoln, on June 8, had been unanimously renominated for the presidency by the Republican convention at Baltimore. The Democratic leaders had postponed their convention to a date unusually

late, in the hope that some advantage might be reaped from the events of the summer. The convention came together on August 29 in Chicago. Mr. Vallandigham, who had returned from his banishment, and whom the government had sagaciously declined to rearrest, led the extreme peace party in the convention. Prominent politicians of New York were present in the interest of Gen. McClellan. Both sections of the convention gained their point. Gen. McClellan was nominated for the presidency, and Mr. Vallandigham succeeded in imposing upon his party a platform declaring that the war had been a failure, and demanding a cessation of hostilities. The capture of Atlanta on the day the convention adjourned seemed to the Unionists a providential answer to the opposition. Republicans, who had been somewhat disheartened by the slow progress of military events and by the open and energetic agitation that the peace party had continued through the summer at the north, now took heart again, and the canvass proceeded with the greatest spirit to the close. Sheridan's victory over Early in the Shenandoah valley gave an added impulse to the general enthusiasm, and in the October elections it was shown that the name of Mr. Lincoln was more popular, and his influence more powerful, than any one had anticipated. In the election that took place on November 8, 1864, he received 2,216,000 votes, and Gen. McClellan,

1,800,000. The difference in the electoral vote was still greater, Mr. Lincoln being supported by 212 of the presidential electors, while only 21 voted for McClellan.

President Lincoln's second inaugural address, delivered on March 4, 1865, will forever remain not only one of the most remarkable of all his public utterances, but will also hold a high rank among the greatest state papers that history has preserved. As he neared the end of his career, and saw plainly outlined before him the dimensions of the vast moral and material success that the nation was about to achieve, his thoughts, always predisposed to an earnest and serious view of life, assumed a fervor and exaltation like that of the ancient seers and prophets. The speech that he delivered to the vast concourse at the eastern front of the capitol is the briefest of all the presidential addresses in our annals; but it has not its equal in lofty eloquence and austere morality. The usual historical view of the situation, the ordinary presentment of the intentions of the government, seemed matters too trivial to engage the concern of a mind standing, as Lincoln's apparently did at this moment, face to face with the most tremendous problems of fate and moral responsibility. In the briefest words he announced what had been the cause of the war, and how the government had hoped to bring it to an earlier close. With passionless candor he admitted

that neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration it had attained.

“Each looked for an easier triumph and a result less fundamental and astounding”; and, passing into a strain of rhapsody, which no lesser mind and character could ever dare to imitate, he said: “Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God, and each invokes his aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God’s assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men’s faces. But let us judge not, that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered; that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has his own purposes. ‘Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh.’ If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offences which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both north and south this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offence came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the

bondsman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.' With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and a lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

The triumphant election of Mr. Lincoln, no less than the steady progress of the National armies, convinced some of the more intelligent of the southern leaders that their cause was hopeless, and that it would be prudent to ascertain what terms of peace could be made before the utter destruction of their military power. There had been already several futile attempts at opening negotiations; but they had all failed of necessity, because neither side was willing even to consider the only terms that the other side would offer. There had never been a moment when Mr. Lincoln would have been willing to receive propositions of peace on any other basis than the recognition of the national integrity, and Mr. Davis steadfastly refused to the end to

Nauvoo, Feb. 14th 1839

Dear Stuart

I have a note in Bank which
falls due some time between the 20th & 25th
of this month— Butler stands as principal,
and I as security; but I am in reality the
principal— It will take between 50 & 55
dollars to renew it— Butler has more than
that much money in his hands which he col-
lects on a debt of mine since I came away—

I wish you to call at the Bank, have a note
filled out my name signed below, get Butler
to sign it, and also to let you have the money
to renew it— Doing won't do any thing— He is
not worth a damn— Your friend A. Lincoln

admit the possibility of the restoration of the national authority. In July, certain authorized persons in Canada, having persuaded Horace Greeley that negotiations might be opened through them with the Confederate authorities, Mr. Lincoln despatched the great editor to Niagara Falls, and sent an open letter addressed, "To whom it may concern." It is in the possession of Mr. William H. Appleton, of New York. This document put an end to the negotiation. The Confederate emissaries in Canada and their principals in Richmond made no use of this incident except to employ the president's letter as a text for denunciation of the National government. But, later in the year, the hopelessness of the struggle having become apparent to some of the Confederate leaders, Mr. Davis was at last induced to send an embassy to Fortress Monroe, to inquire what terms of adjustment were possible. They were met by President Lincoln and the secretary of state in person. The plan proposed was one that had been suggested, on his own responsibility, by Mr. Francis Preston Blair, of Washington, in an interview he had been permitted to hold with Mr. Davis in Richmond, that the two armies should unite in a campaign against the French in Mexico for the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, and that the issues of the war should be postponed for future settlement. The president declined peremptorily to entertain this

scheme, and repeated again the only conditions to which he could listen: The restoration of the national authority throughout all the states, the maintenance and execution of all the acts of the general government in regard to slavery, the cessation of hostilities, and the disbanding of the insurgent forces as a necessary prerequisite to the ending of the war.

The Confederate agents reported at Richmond the failure of their embassy, and Mr. Davis denounced the conduct of President Lincoln in a public address full of desperate defiance. Nevertheless, it was evident even to the most prejudiced observers that the war could not continue much longer. Sherman's march had demonstrated the essential weakness of the Confederate cause; the soldiers of the Confederacy—who for four years, with the most stubborn gallantry, had maintained a losing fight—began to show signs of dangerous discouragement and insubordination; recruiting had ceased some time before, and desertion was going on rapidly. The army of Gen. Lee, which was the last bulwark of the Confederacy, still held its lines stoutly against the gradually enveloping lines of Grant; but their valiant commander knew it was only a question of how many days he could hold his works, and repeatedly counselled the government at Richmond to evacuate that city, and allow the army to take up a more tenable position

in the mountains. Gen. Grant's only anxiety each morning was lest he should find the army of Gen. Lee moving away from him, and late in March he determined to strike the final blow at the rebellion. Moving for the last time by the left flank, his forces under Sheridan fought and gained a brilliant victory over the Confederate left at Five Forks, and at the same time Gens. Humphreys, Wright, and Parke moved against the Confederate works, breaking their lines and capturing many prisoners and guns. Petersburg was evacuated on April 2. The Confederate government fled from Richmond the same afternoon and evening, and Grant, pursuing the broken and shattered remnant of Lee's army, received their surrender at Appomattox Court-House on April 9. About 28,000 Confederates signed the parole, and an equal number had been killed, captured, and dispersed in the operations immediately preceding the surrender. Gen. Sherman, a few days afterward, received the surrender of Johnston, and the last Confederate army, under Gen. Edmund Kirby Smith, west of the Mississippi, laid down its arms.

President Lincoln had himself accompanied the army in its last triumphant campaign, and had entered Richmond immediately after its surrender, receiving the cheers and benedictions not only of the negroes whom he had set free, but of a great number of white people, who were weary of the

war and welcomed the advent of peace. Returning to Washington with his mind filled with plans for the restoration of peace and orderly government throughout the south, he seized the occasion of a serenade, on April 11, to deliver to the people who gathered in front of the executive mansion his last speech on public affairs, in which he discussed with unusual dignity and force the problems of reconstruction, then crowding upon public consideration. As his second inaugural was the greatest of all his rhetorical compositions, so this brief political address, which closed his public career, is unsurpassed among his speeches for clearness and wisdom, and for a certain tone of gentle but unmistakable authority, which shows to what a mastery of statecraft he had attained. He congratulated the country upon the decisive victories of the last week; he expressly asserted that, although he had been present in the final operations, "no part of the honor, for plan or execution, was his"; and then, with equal boldness and discretion, announced the principles in accordance with which he should deal with the restoration of the states. He refused to be provoked into controversy, which he held would be purely academic, over the question whether the insurrectionary states were in or out of the Union. "As appears to me," he said, "that question has not been, nor yet is, a practically material one, and any discussion of it, while it thus remains practically

immaterial, could have no effect other than the mischievous one of dividing our friends. As yet, whatever it may hereafter become, that question is bad, as the basis of a controversy, and good for nothing at all—merely pernicious abstraction. We all agree that the seceded states, so called, are out of their proper practical relation with the Union, and that the sole object of the government, civil and military, in regard to those states, is to again get them into that proper practical relation. I believe it is not only possible, but in fact easier, to do this without deciding, or even considering, whether these states have ever been out of the Union than with it. Finding themselves safely at home, it would be utterly immaterial whether they had ever been abroad. Let us all join in doing the acts necessary to restoring the proper practical relations between these states and the Union, and each forever after innocently indulge his own opinion whether in doing the acts he brought the states from without into the Union, or only gave them proper assistance, they never having been out of it.”

In this temper he discussed the recent action of the Unionists of Louisiana, where 12,000 voters had sworn allegiance, giving his full approval to their course, but not committing himself to any similar method in other cases; “any exclusive and inflexible plan would surely become a new entanglement.

. . . If we reject and spurn them, we do our utmost to disorganize and disperse them. We, in effect, say to the white men, 'You are worthless or worse, we will neither help you, nor be helped by you.' To the blacks we say, 'This cup of liberty which these, your old masters, hold to your lips we will dash from you and leave you to the chances of gathering the spilled and scattered contents in some vague and undefined when, where, and how.

. . . If, on the contrary, we sustain the new government of Louisiana, the converse is made true. Concede that it is only to what it should be as the egg is to the fowl, we shall sooner have the fowl by hatching the egg than by smashing it." These words were the last he uttered in public; on April 14, at a cabinet meeting, he developed these views in detail, and found no difference of opinion among his advisers. The same evening he attended a performance of "Our American Cousin" at Ford's theatre, in Tenth street. He was accompanied by Mrs. Lincoln and two friends—Miss Harris, a daughter of Senator Ira Harris, of New York, and Maj. Henry R. Rathbone. In the midst of the play a shot was heard, and a man was seen to leap from the president's box to the stage. Brandishing a dripping knife, with which, after shooting the president, he had stabbed Maj. Rathbone, and shouting, "Sic semper tyrannis!—the south is avenged!" he rushed to the rear of the building,

leaped upon a horse, which was held there in readiness for him, and made his escape. The president was carried to a small house on the opposite side of the street, where, surrounded by his family and the principal officers of the government, he breathed his last at 7 o'clock on the morning of April 15. The assassin was found by a squadron of troops twelve days afterward, and shot in a barn in which he had taken refuge.

The body of the president lay in state at the Capitol on April 20 and was viewed by a great concourse of people; the next day the funeral train set out for Springfield, Ill. The *cortège* halted at all the principal cities on the way, and the remains of the president lay in state in Baltimore, Harrisburg, Philadelphia, New York, Albany, Buffalo, Cleveland, and Chicago, being received everywhere with extraordinary demonstrations of respect and sorrow. The joy over the return of peace was for a fortnight eclipsed by the universal grief for the dead leader. He was buried, amid the mourning of the whole nation, at Oak Ridge, near Springfield, on May 4, and there on October 15, 1874, an imposing monument—the work of the sculptor Larkin G. Mead—was dedicated to his memory. The monument is of white marble, with a portrait-statue of Lincoln in bronze, and four bronze groups at the corners, representing the infantry, cavalry, and artillery arms of the service and the navy.

The death of President Lincoln, in the moment of the great national victory that he had done more than any other to gain, caused a movement of sympathy throughout the world. The expressions of grief and condolence that were sent to the government at Washington, from national, provincial, and municipal bodies all over the globe, were afterward published by the state department in a quarto volume of nearly a thousand pages, called "The Tribute of the Nations to Abraham Lincoln." After the lapse of thirty years, the high estimate of him that the world appears instinctively to have formed at the moment of his death seems to have been increased rather than diminished, as his participation in the great events of his time has been more thoroughly studied and understood. His goodness of heart, his abounding charity, his quick wit and overflowing humor, which made him the hero of many true stories and a thousand legends, are not less valued in themselves; but they are cast in the shade by the evidences that continually appear of his extraordinary qualities of mind and of character. His powerful grasp of details, his analytic capacity, his unerring logic, his perception of human nature would have made him unusual in any age of the world, while the quality that, in the opinion of many, made him the specially fitted agent of Providence in the salvation of the country, his absolute freedom from prejudice or passion in

weighing the motives of his contemporaries and the deepest problems of state, gives him pre-eminence even among the illustrious men that have preceded and followed him in his great office. Simple and modest as he was in his demeanor, he was one of the most self-respecting of rulers. Although his kindness of heart was proverbial, although he was always glad to please and unwilling to offend, few presidents have been more sensible of the dignity of their office, and more prompt to maintain it against encroachments. He was at all times unquestionably the head of the government and, though not inclined to interfere with the routine business of the departments, he tolerated no insubordination in important matters. At one time, being conscious that there was an effort inside of his government to force the resignation of one of its members, he read in open cabinet a severe reprimand of what was going on, mentioning no names, and ordering peremptorily that no question should be asked, and no allusions be made to the incident then or thereafter.

He did not except his most trusted friends or his most powerful generals from this strict subordination. When Mr. Seward went before him to meet the Confederate envoys at Hampton Roads, Mr. Lincoln gave him this written injunction: "You will not assume to definitely consummate anything"; and on March 3, 1865, when

Gen. Grant was about to set out on his campaign of final victory, the secretary of war gave him, by the president's order, this imperative instruction: "The president directs me to say to you that he wishes you to have no conference with Gen. Lee, unless it be for the capitulation of Gen. Lee's army, or on some other minor and purely military matter. He instructs me to say that you are not to decide, discuss, or to confer upon any political question. Such questions the president holds in his own hands, and will submit them to no military conferences or conventions. Meanwhile, you are to press to the utmost your military advantages." When he refused to comply with the desire of the more radical Republicans in congress to take Draconian measures of retaliation against the Confederates for their treatment of black soldiers, he was accused by them of weakness and languor. They never seemed to perceive that to withstand an angry congress in Washington required more vigor of character than to launch a threatening decree against the Confederate government in Richmond. Mr. Lincoln was as unusual in personal appearance as in character. His stature was almost gigantic, six feet and four inches; he was muscular but spare of frame, weighing about 180 pounds. His hair was strong and luxuriant in growth, and stood out straight from his head; it began to be touched with gray in his last years. His eyes, a grayish brown,

were deeply set, and were filled, in repose, with an expression of profound melancholy, which easily changed to one of uproarious mirth at the provocation of a humorous anecdote, told by himself or another. His nose was long and slightly curved, his mouth large and singularly mobile. Up to the time of his election he was clean-shaven, but during his presidency the fine outline of his face was marred by a thin and straggling beard. His demeanor was, in general, extremely simple and careless, but he was not without a native dignity that always protected him from anything like presumption or impertinence.


Mr. Lincoln married, on November 4, 1842, Miss Mary Todd, daughter of Robert S. Todd, of Kentucky. There were born of this marriage four sons. One, Edward Baker, died in infancy; another, William Wallace, died at the age of twelve, during the presidency of Mr. Lincoln; and still another, Thomas, at the age of eighteen, several years after his father's death. The only one that grew to maturity was his eldest son, Robert, who married and has children. The house in which Mr. Lincoln lived when he was elected president, in Springfield, Ill., was conveyed to the state of Illinois in 1887 by his son, and a collection of memorials of him is to be preserved there perpetually.

There were few portraits of Mr. Lincoln painted in his lifetime; the vast number of engravings that

300 LIVES OF THE PRESIDENTS

have made his face one of the most familiar of all time have been mostly copied from photographs. There are portraits from life by Frank B. Carpenter, by Matthew Wilson, by Thomas Hicks, and an excellent crayon drawing by Barry. Since his death G. P. A. Healy, William Page, and others have painted portraits of him. There are two authentic life-masks: one made in 1858 by Leonard W. Volk, who also executed a bust of Mr. Lincoln before his election in 1860, and another by Clark Mills shortly before the assassination. There are already a number of statues: one by Henry Kirke Brown in Union square, New York; another by the same artist in Brooklyn; one in the group called "Emancipation," by Thomas Ball, in Lincoln Park, Washington, D. C., a work which has especial interest as having been paid for by the contributions of the freed people; one by Mrs. Vinnie Ream Hoxie in the Capital; one by Augustus St. Gaudens in Chicago, set up in Chicago, October 22, 1887; and one by Randolph Rogers in Fairmount Park, Philadelphia. There is a bust by Thomas D. Jones, modelled from life in 1860.

The Lincoln bibliography is enormous, comprising thousands of volumes. See John Russell Bartlett's "Catalogue of Books and Pamphlets relating to the Civil War in the United States" (Boston, 1866). The most noteworthy of the lives of Lincoln already published are those of Joseph H.



Henry Bacon, architect

THE PROPOSED LINCOLN MEMORIAL, WASHINGTON, D. C. EASTERN FAÇADE FACING WASHINGTON MONUMENT

Barrett (Cincinnati, 1865); Linus P. Brockett (Philadelphia, 1865); Henry J. Raymond (New York, 1865); Josiah G. Holland (Springfield, Mass., 1866); Ward H. Lamon (Boston, 1872); William O. Stoddard (New York, 1884); Isaac N. Arnold (Chicago, 1885); William H. Herndon (New York, 1889); and John T. Morse, Jr. (Boston, 1893). Briefer lives have also been written by William D. Howells, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, Charles G. Leland, John Carroll Power, Carl Schurz, and others. The most extensive work upon his life and times yet attempted is by his private secretaries, John G. Nicolay and John Hay, in ten volumes (New York, 1890). Four years later the same writers prepared a complete edition in two volumes of Lincoln's Works, comprising his Speeches, Letters, State Papers, and Miscellaneous Writings (New York, 1894). See also "Abraham Lincoln. The tribute of a century, 1809-1909. Commemorative of the Lincoln centenary and containing the principal addresses made in connection therewith." Edited by Nathan W. MacChesney (Chicago, 1910).

His wife, MARY TODD, born in Lexington, Ky., December 12, 1818; died in Springfield, Ill., July 16, 1882, was the daughter of Robert S. Todd, whose family were among the most influential of the pioneers of Kentucky and Illinois. Her great-

uncle, John Todd, was one of the associates of Gen. George Rogers Clark, in his campaign of 1778, and took part in the capture of Kaskaskia and Vincennes. Being appointed county lieutenant by Patrick Henry, at that time governor of Virginia, he organized the civil government of what became afterward the state of Illinois. He was killed in the battle of Blue Licks, August 18, 1782, of which his brother Levi, Mrs. Lincoln's grandfather, who also accompanied Clark's expedition as a lieutenant, was one of the few survivors. Mary Todd was carefully educated in Lexington. When twenty-one years of age she went to Springfield to visit her sister, who had married Ninian W. Edwards, a son of Ninian Edwards, governor of the state. While there she became engaged to Mr. Lincoln, whom she married, November 4, 1842. Her family was divided by the civil war; several of them were killed in battle; and, devoted as Mrs. Lincoln was to her husband and the National cause, this division among her nearest kindred caused her much suffering. The death of her son, William Wallace, in 1862, was an enduring sorrow to her. One of her principal occupations was visiting the hospitals and camps of the soldiers about Washington. She never recovered from the shock of seeing her husband shot down before her eyes; her youngest son, Thomas, died a few years later, and her reason suffered from these repeated blows. She lived in

strict retirement during her later years, spending part of her time with her son in Chicago, a portion in Europe, and the rest with her sister, Mrs. Edwards, in Springfield, Illinois, where she died of paralysis.

Their son, ROBERT TODD, lawyer, born in Springfield, Ill., August 1, 1843, was prepared for college at Phillips Exeter academy, and graduated at Harvard in 1864. He entered Harvard law-school, but after a short stay applied for admission to the military service, and his father suggested his appointment on the staff of Gen. Grant, as a volunteer aide-de-camp without pay or allowances. This exceptional position did not meet with Gen. Grant's approval, and at his suggestion young Lincoln was regularly commissioned as a captain, and entered the service on the same footing with others of his grade. He served with zeal and efficiency throughout the final campaign, which ended at Appomattox. At the close of the war he resumed the study of law, was admitted to the bar in Illinois, and practised his profession with success in Chicago until 1881, with an interval of a visit to Europe in 1872; he steadily refused the offers that were repeatedly made him to enter public life, though taking part, from time to time, in political work and discussion. In 1881, at the invitation of President Garfield, he

entered his cabinet as secretary of war. Mr. Lincoln, who, sixteen years before, had returned from the field just in time to stand by the death-bed of his father, assassinated while president, now had his strange experience repeated upon the assassination of President Garfield, a few months after his inauguration. On the accession of Vice-President Arthur to the Presidency, Mr. Lincoln was the only member of the former cabinet who was requested to retain his portfolio, and he did so to the end of the administration. He performed the duties of the place with such ability and fairness, and with such knowledge of the law and appreciation of the needs of the army, as to gain the warmest approbation of its officers and its friends. Noteworthy incidents of his administration of the civil duties of the department were his report to the house of representatives upon its challenge to him to justify President Arthur's veto of the river and harbor bill of 1882, and the thoroughness and promptness of the relief given, from Wheeling to New Orleans, to those suffering from the great floods of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers in February, 1884. In the latter year Mr. Lincoln was prominently spoken of for the presidency; but, as President Arthur was a candidate before the Republican convention, Lincoln refused to allow his name to be presented for either place on the

ticket. He returned to Chicago, and in the spring of 1889 he was appointed minister to Great Britain. He was succeeded in June, 1893, by Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware, as ambassador, and resumed his law practice in Chicago. For several years Mr. Lincoln's winter residence has been in Washington, D. C., and his summer home in Manchester, Vermont.

PORTRAITS OF THE
LADIES OF THE WHITE HOUSE

FROM 1837 TO 1865

ANGELICA VAN BUREN

ANNA HARRISON

JULIA G. TYLER

SARAH C. POLK

ABIGAIL FILLMORE

JANE M. PIERCE

H. L. JOHNSTON

MARY LINCOLN



Angelina Van Buren

Mrs. Abraham Van Buren.
Daughter-in-law of Martin Van Buren.
After a portrait painted by Henry Inman.



D. Harrison

Mrs. William Henry Harrison.




Julia G. Tyler

Mrs. John Tyler.



Sarah C. Polk

Mrs. James K. Polk.



Abigail Fillmore

Mrs. Millard Fillmore.



Jane A. Pierce

Mrs. Franklin Pierce.



H. E. Johnston

Mrs. Henry Elliott Johnston.
Niece of James Buchanan.



Mary Lincoln

Mrs. Abraham Lincoln.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



134 649

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY